

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Florida



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

76

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Overview:

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section, assumes primary responsibility for the exceptional student education (ESE) monitoring and dispute resolution functions for the state's 76 local educational agencies (LEA).

Monitoring System

The bureau implements a leveled (tiered) system of compliance monitoring. All districts participate in an annual desktop monitoring process that is verified by the bureau. Some districts participate in on-site monitoring and technical assistance visits based, in part, on data gathered through this process.

Desktop Monitoring (Levels 1 and 2)

The desktop monitoring process comprises both basic (Level 1) and focused (Level 2) components to ensure that school districts comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and state statutes and rules, while focusing on student outcomes. The bureau has developed Web-based compliance protocols to align with selected indicators using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements document. The specific standards (i.e., regulatory requirements) OSEP determined to relate most directly to each priority area and indicator under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as Florida-specific statutes and rules, are incorporated into the protocols, which include the citations for each standard.

Desktop monitoring is the process where districts review critical components of their ESE programs. Districts are responsible for completing the protocols and for identifying and reporting on required corrective actions. Information from these protocols is submitted to the bureau via the ESE General Supervision Website (GSW). Corrective action plans and correction of noncompliance findings are also reported and tracked via this website.

On-Site Monitoring and Technical Assistance (Level 3)

The purposes of the on-site monitoring and technical assistance process include the following:

1. Support districts in their efforts to improve results that ensure all students with disabilities graduate college and career ready by reducing barriers to equity and access.
2. Monitor compliance with related IDEA regulations and corresponding state rules to include state statutory requirements related to the use of restraint and seclusion.

Criteria for Selection of Districts

Those indicators include:

1. Identification as a district that is required to set aside 15 percent of the IDEA, Part B funds for early intervening services based on data reflecting disproportionate representation for discipline or over-identification
2. District performance regarding
 - Percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a standard high school diploma
 - Percentage of students with individual educational plans (IEPs) dropping out of high school
 - Rates of suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs
 - Percentage of students served in the regular education environment
 - Postsecondary outcomes
3. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification
4. Reported incidents of restraint or seclusion

Dispute Resolution

The responsibilities and activities of the Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section also include the following: facilitation of informal resolution at the local level, provision of state-sponsored mediation, provision of state-sponsored facilitated IEP process, and investigation of formal state complaints and oversight of the IDEA related due process hearing system. On a daily basis, bureau staff respond to parent calls and written correspondence regarding concerns related to the education of children with disabilities and facilitate communication between the parents and the districts. Information and resources are also provided to parents and districts to assist in the resolution of the issues. When the issues cannot be resolved informally at the local level, parents may request state-sponsored mediation, file a formal state complaint or request a due process hearing.

Facilitated IEP

Training is provided to IEP participants in all districts regarding the facilitated IEP process. Districts are supported through the discretionary projects to offer facilitation at the district level. Facilitation requests are also received and processed by bureau staff for state-sponsored facilitators. State-sponsored facilitators are provided at no cost to the parents or the district.

Mediation

Mediation requests are received and processed by bureau staff with contracted mediators. State-sponsored mediation is provided at no cost to the parents or the district. Formal complaints are investigated by bureau staff who offer mediation and early resolution to the complainants and the districts as an alternative remedy. If both parties agree to mediation and the extension of the complaint, the complaint investigation is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the mediation process (which usually takes place within two weeks of the request). If both parties agree to early resolution, the complainant and the district attempt to reach an agreement regarding the issues of the formal complaint. If an agreement is reached, the parties execute a legally binding agreement that sets forth the resolution and is signed by both parties. The written, signed mediation agreement is enforceable in state

or U.S. district court.

State Complaint

For formal complaints that proceed to full investigation, both parties are provided an opportunity to submit documentation regarding the complainant's allegations and the district's response. Following FDOE's review of documentation and other inquiry activities which may include telephone interviews, records reviews or on-site visits, a report is issued within 60 days of the full filing per federal law with findings of fact, conclusions, reasons for the decision and recommendations, required actions or corrective actions, as appropriate. A due process hearing may be requested in addition to a request for mediation or the filing of a formal complaint. If all three are requested, the mediation occurs first (if both parties agree to mediate). If the complaint issues are the same as the issues to be addressed in the due process hearing, the complaint inquiry is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the due process hearing. If there are issues in the complaint that are not a part of the due process hearing, investigation of these issues may proceed during the time that the due process hearing is pending. Complaint issues that are not addressed in due process may be investigated following the completion of the due process hearing.

Due Process Hearings

Due process hearing requests are submitted by parents to the local education agency (LEA), and forwarded by the LEA to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH), the agency that conducts the hearings. Administrative law judges (ALJs), who are employed by DOAH and provided training by the FDOE, make determinations regarding the cases and provide information to the bureau. FDOE maintains the records following completion of the cases and provides oversight for the system (i.e. timelines, review of orders and training of ALJs). Data related to the corrective actions identified through complaints and due process are maintained by the bureau.

Additional information is on the bureau's website at <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/dispute-resolution>.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Introduction

The bureau has developed and currently implements a comprehensive, overarching framework for effectively supporting districts based on evidence of need. Implementing this framework requires ongoing, continuous improvement effort using the systematic change process over time. The bureau works directly with district leadership to impact change at the school level. The ultimate indicators of success are student levels of performance targeted by the SPP and improved rates of compliance. The primary student population is general education students who have been identified as students with disabilities entitling them to additional supports and services in accordance with the IDEA.

History

The bureau team members began each effort with the question, "What are the desired outcomes and how will they be measured?" In 2012, it was established that the desired outcome of our systemic effort was to provide a model of multi-tiered support to districts. This integrated system of supports, services, skills and resources is evidenced by:

- An established universal screening system for determining tiered levels of support to school districts based on need

- A dynamic method (organizational structure that enables the flexible distribution of bureau resources based on specific need) for responding to those needs with integrated tools, products and

- resources for building capacity to support successful outcomes for students

- An annual increase in districts' knowledge, skills, practices and satisfaction with bureau support

Current System

As is expected of districts, the bureau uses a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) as the framework for planning bureau support to districts and allocating resources to meet the student performance goals, in accordance with the FDOE and the bureau strategic plans and district-identified needs. A structured, problem-solving process is applied to address systemic and specific issues impacting educational outcomes of students with disabilities articulated in strategic goals. The work of bureau teams is organized around an MTSS, and the bureau provides a continuum of supports (technical assistance, training, resources, evidence-based practices, technology and policies) to districts in order to improve student achievement.

The bureau currently offers a continuum of supports to districts designed to improve education for students with disabilities as evidenced by increased positive SPP indicator data and increased rates of compliance. The following list of examples conveys the current universal, supplemental and intensive supports provided by the bureau, which is updated based on evaluation of effectiveness over time.

Universal Supports - General, statewide support designed to inform, assist and improve results for all districts:

- The bureau, MTSS and Student Support Services websites

- Special Programs and Procedures structure

- Technical assistance papers Publications and professional development

- Web-available resources via discretionary projects

- ESE compliance manual

- Various bureau-hosted presentations (e.g. Administrators' Management Meeting [AMM], and the Council of Administrators of Special Education [CASE])

- Discretionary project administration (e.g. liaisons, project tracking system [PTS], calls and meetings)

- Professional development portal Statewide IEP system with facilitated IEP training

- LEA profiles and databook

- Family and community engagement efforts (e.g. brochures, videos, and Family Café)

- Level 1 desktop monitoring (basic protocols)

- ESE General Supervision Website (GSW)

- LEA size-alike and/or issue-alike problem-solving groups

- Technical assistance through directors' conference calls and topical calls for district supervisors

- Collaboration with state department on various initiatives

Supplemental Supports - More focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to subgroups of districts in response to identified needs:

- Targeted assistance in specific indicators from bureau indicator teams

- Targeted size-alike and/or issue-alike problem-solving groups

- Targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects (by district/school request)

Daily, quick-response correspondence with families, district, school and organizations through phone calls and emails
Level 2 desktop monitoring (i.e. specific and focused protocols)
GSW for voluntary district use
Various bureau presentations in response to a reported need (e.g. Institute for Small and Rural Districts, Working with the Experts, and other discretionary projects)
Informal conflict resolution between districts and families
Program-area staff specialization and regular district-contact calls

Intensive Supports - Most focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to individual districts in response to identified needs:

Individualized, targeted assistance (e.g., specific indicator support from bureau indicator teams)
Individualized, targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects
GSW for target districts
Level 3 on-site monitoring visits and required corrective actions
Formal mediation between districts and families
State complaint procedures, including required corrective actions

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The State has mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based professional development and support to LEAs. This mechanism is based on the needs of districts and managed through the five-year bureau strategic plan. Each strategic plan team focuses on specific needs and provides in-person and online professional development through bureau staff, discretionary projects and other professionals. The following are examples of professional development that was provided by discretionary projects related to best practices for inclusion:

Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE)

Building Inclusive Schools

Disability Awareness Differentiating Instruction Universal Design for Learning

Accessible Instructional Materials

Access to the General Curriculum

Accommodations and Modifications

Inclusive Practices for the Developmentally Appropriate Pre-K Classroom

Leadership for Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

For best practices for literacy and STEM (science, technology, engineering and math):

Access Points/Essential Understandings

Differentiating Reading Instruction, Differentiating Math Instruction, Differentiating Science Instruction

Specially Designed Instruction and Interventions

Working with the Experts for Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, Working with the Experts for Speech and Language

Accommodations for Students with Visual Impairments

Using Assistive Technology

Strategic Instruction Model, Assessment

Technology for Student Success: Tools for Reading Comprehension

For best practices related to positive behavior and student engagement:

Positive Behavior Support

The ABS's of Behavior

Positive Alternatives to Restraint, Seclusion and Suspension/Expulsion

Trauma Informed Care

Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement and Participation (CHAMPS)

Crisis Prevention Institute

Behavior Remediation Strategies

Restorative Practices

Behavior Management for Paraprofessionals

Youth Mental Health First Aid (Train the Trainer)

For best practices related to graduation and transition:

Graduation Requirements Check and Connect Mentor Training

Dynamic Dropout Prevention

Using an Early Warning System to Increase Graduation Success of Students with Disabilities

Developing Interagency Transition Teams

Using Transition Assessment Data to Write Measurable Postsecondary Goals

Discovery Process for Students in Transition

Building Work Skills for Employment Success: Strategies and Resources

Introduction to Secondary Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities

Self Determination and Self Advocacy

Supporting Graduation and Attendance in Juvenile Justice Programs

Discretionary projects provided professional development to support prekindergarten program effectiveness, program quality, inclusion, evaluation and assessment, curriculum and instruction, transition, child outcome measurement and family involvement, as well as Child Find awareness and outreach.

Discretionary projects also provided training to meet district needs pertaining to parent involvement. These trainings were designed to promote effective parent participation in the education of children who are exceptional or have special needs. In addition, over 200 sessions in the areas of Advocacy, Assistive Technology, Birth to Five, Disaster Preparedness, Employment, and Mental Health were provided to 12,842 attendees at the 2019 Family Café Conference. These are listed at <https://www.familycafe.net/publications>.

Since 2013, the bureau has worked collaboratively with Key2Ed and the discretionary project, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, to provide professional development regarding the facilitated IEP process to all districts. The purpose of this training is to provide district staff with the skills needed to facilitate IEP meetings that result in productive collaboration between parents and school staff.

Bureau staff and other professionals provided professional development at the annual Administrators Management Meeting (AMM). Specific professional development sessions provided at AMM in 2019 included:

Using Data Well

Discipline of Students with Disabilities

Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR)

Roadmap Action Planning

Peers as Partners in Learning

State Complaints for Students in DJJ/County Jails

Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS)

Florida Postsecondary Comprehensive Transition Programs

Multi-Tiered System of Support

ESSA

Mental Health Plans

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and Placement Under the IDEA

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The development of Florida's SPP is the responsibility of strategic plan teams that include staff from the FDOE, staff from discretionary projects funded by the FDOE (including district- and school-level representation) and individuals from other agencies. Each team includes individuals with expertise pertinent to the indicator.

Florida's State Advisory Committee has also been a critical stakeholder group for the development of the SPP and the APR. A draft of the initial targets was provided to this group in 2014 and input was taken at their biannual meeting. Those recommendations were also shared with the strategic plan teams, and revisions to the targets were made, if necessary. The advisory committee continues to meet and provide input for revisions, if necessary, each year. Most recently, the committee met July 15-16, 2019. The committee contains a majority of members who are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

In addition, the committee has representatives that are appointed by the governor, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other state agencies involved in financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter schools, a representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care, and representatives from the state juvenile and adult corrections agencies.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

Within 120 days following Florida's submission of the APR, LEA profiles will be produced and posted on the FDOE website. The LEA profiles are intended to be used as a tool for planning for systemic improvement in exceptional education programs. The profiles contain a series of data indicators that describe measures of educational benefit, educational environment, prevalence and parent involvement for each LEA in the state. Also included in the APR is information about state-level targets from Florida's SPP/APR, LEA performance on the indicators and whether the LEA met each of the state's targets. Past LEA profiles can be found on our Bureau website at <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>.

A copy of the complete SPP/APR can be found at <https://osep.grads360.org/#report/apr/2016B/publicView?state=FL&ispublic=true>. Please note this is the link to GRADS360°.

In addition to the LEA profiles, more detailed information about assessment participation and proficiency can be found in the annually produced Databook, also found at <http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7672/urlt/Databook20.pdf>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

For the State Systemic Improvement Plan, the Florida Department of Education (FDOE), in collaboration with its internal and external stakeholders, identified the measurable result of increasing the statewide graduation rate for students with disabilities from 52.3% (2012-13 graduates) to 62.3% (2017-18 graduates) and cutting the graduation gap (baseline 23.2 percentage points in 2012-13) for students with disabilities in half (to 11.6 percentage points). The State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is related to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) results Indicator #1: Percentage of youth with individual educational plans graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. §1416(b)).

The focus of the SSIP implementation is building Florida's SEA's capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of evidence based practices (EBPs) that will lead to measurable improvement in the SiMR for students with disabilities. To support the LEA's implementation of the coherent improvement strategies, the SEA has provided a continuum of supports (e.g., technical assistance, training, resources, EBPs, technology and policies) to districts,

schools and families. The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (bureau) provides this support with a multi-tiered, data-based approach. As a result, some districts receive more intensive, focused support.

A complete report on the progress of the SiMR will be provided upon the submission of the SSIP on April 1, 2020.

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support visit to the State on December 9-11, 2020, and is currently developing a response that will be issued under separate cover.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	44.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	54.30%	54.30%	56.30%	58.30%	60.30%
Data	52.32%	55.06%	56.80%	61.55%	66.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	62.30%	70.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau.

Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout

rate and postschool outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder

groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the

members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Family Network on Disabilities
- Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)
- Florida College System
- Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities
- Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
- Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)

- Florida Youth Council
- Institute for Small and Rural Districts
- Learning Disabilities Association of Florida
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System
- The Able Trust

The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Florida College System
- FDOE of Dropout Prevention
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
- FDLRS
- Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)
- SEDNET
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System

This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionality as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 was set based on the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Extensive stakeholder input was sought.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	17,517
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	22,630
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	77.41%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17,517	22,630	66.00%	62.30%	77.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

As outlined in Section 1003.4282, Florida Statutes, to earn a standard diploma in Florida for the cohort of students who graduated in 2018 include the following course, credit and assessment requirements as follows:

Four credits in English/English language arts (ELA). A student must pass the statewide, standardized Grade 10 Reading assessment, or earn a concordant score, in order to graduate with a standard high school diploma.

Four credits in mathematics, which must include Algebra 1 and Geometry. The statewide, standardized Algebra 1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student must pass the Algebra 1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment or earn a concordant score for graduation with a standard high school diploma. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education may substitute the certification for one mathematics credit. Substitution may occur for up to two mathematics credits, except for Algebra 1 and Geometry.

Three credits in science, two of which must have a laboratory component. A student who takes Biology 1 must take the statewide, standardized Biology 1 EOC assessment. The Biology 1 EOC assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education, may substitute the certification for one science credit, except for Biology 1.

Three credits in social studies of which one credit in World History, one credit in United States History, one-half credit in United States Government and one-half credit in economics are required. A student who takes United States History must take the statewide, standardized United States History EOC assessment; the student's performance on the assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade.

One credit in fine or performing arts, speech and debate, or practical arts.

One credit in physical education.

Eight credits in electives.

Students may also earn a standard high school diploma using an 18-credit-hour option, which includes all of the above, except physical education is not required, and requires three electives instead of eight.

A waiver of standardized assessment results may be granted by the IEP team, to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3)(c), Florida Statutes.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	20.35%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	18.60%	16.80%	15.10%	13.40%	11.70%
Data	20.35%	19.25%	18.72%	17.33%	15.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	10.00%	9.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Stakeholder input for Indicator 2 is identical to stakeholder input for Indicator 1. For Indicator 2, stakeholder groups for transition had direct input in choosing targets.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	19,527

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	1,811
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	3,195
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	86

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,195	24,619	15.86%	10.00%	12.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

XXX

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

XXX

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

DNE Any student expected to attend a school but did not enter as expected for unknown reasons and required documented efforts to locate the student are maintained per s. 1003.26, Florida Statutes.

W05 Any student age 16 or older who leaves school voluntarily with no intention of returning and has filed a formal declaration of intent to terminate school enrollment per s. 1003.21, Florida Statutes.

W13 Any student withdrawn from school due to court action. (Does not apply to DJJ students).

W15 Any student withdrawn from school due to nonattendance after all procedures outlined in sections 1003.26 and 1003.27, Florida Statutes, have been

followed.

W18 Any student withdrawn from school due to medical reasons and is unable to receive educational services, such as those provided through the hospital/homebound program.

W21 Any student withdrawn from school due to being expelled with no educational services.

W22 Any student whose whereabouts is unknown and required documented efforts to locate the student are maintained per s.1003.26, Florida Statutes.

W23 Any student withdrawn from school for any other reason than those listed above.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
A	Overall	94.00%	Actual	95.58%	93.60%	94.73%	95.20%	94.98%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
A	Overall	94.00%	Actual	95.70%	95.02%	95.04%	95.54%	95.80%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from FDOE leadership in standards and instructional supports, school improvement, assessment, accountability, curriculum and instruction in ELA (Reading) and math.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	37,523	34,919	35,471	30,924	31,253	28,437	26,896	24,918			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	33,815	30,924	31,188	26,380	9,753	9,654	12,992	13,685			

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	102	108	118	111	16,862	14,240	8,593	5,846			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	3,192	3,232	3,403	3,289	3,410	3,243	3,091	3,096			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	37,408	34,772	35,421	30,659	30,806	28,973					43,678
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	33,545	30,941	31,242	26,203	9,879	10,584					24,885
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	105	99	115	106	16,356	13,753					9,574
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	3,189	3,241	3,422	3,281	3,416	3,240					5,747

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	250,341	240,327	94.98%	99.00%	96.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	241,717	232,923	95.80%	99.00%	96.36%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Assessment participation and performance results for all students, nondisabled and with disabilities are available to view from the following FDOE web links:

- The EDStats online BSI tool: Florida PK-20 Education Information Portal (EdStats) <https://edstats.fldoe.org/> and;
- The Databook 2020: <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>
- School-level data: : <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	47.00%	51.00%	51.00%	56.00%	61.00%
A	Overall	24.91%	Actual	28.98%	24.91%	18.52%	23.98%	24.59%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	47.00%	51.00%	51.00%	56.00%	61.00%
A	Overall	29.43%	Actual	32.09%	29.43%	24.30%	29.50%	30.29%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	66.00%	66.50%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	66.00%	66.50%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from leaders in standards and instructional supports, school improvement, assessment, accountability, curriculum and instruction in ELA and math.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	37,109	34,264	34,709	29,780	30,025	27,137	24,676	22,627			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,380	8,233	7,218	4,996	2,550	2,688	2,905	2,496			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25	33	36	33	1,974	2,043	1,100	634			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,885	1,956	1,964	1,850	1,939	1,939	1,863	1,798			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	36,839	34,281	34,779	29,590	29,651	27,577					40,206
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	12,550	11,332	9,352	5,904	3,224	3,912					5,599
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32	34	42	32	3,070	3,156					1,775
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,872	1,933	1,862	1,780	1,848	2,003					3,392

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	240,327	62,538	24.59%	66.00%	26.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	232,923	74,704	30.29%	66.00%	32.07%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Assessment participation and performance results for all students, nondisabled and with disabilities are available to view from the following FDOE web links:

- The EDStats online BSI tool: Florida PK-20 Education Information Portal (EdStats) <https://edstats.fldoe.org/> and;
- The Databook 2020: <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>
- School-level data: : <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	19.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	11.00%	9.00%	7.00%	4.00%	2.00%
Data	7.69%	11.63%	11.11%	9.30%	7.69%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	5.00%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the state Positive Behavior/Student Engagement (PB/SE) Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and is supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to suspensions and expulsions, restraint and seclusion, and coordinated early intervening services. This collaborative process helped determine the level of support each district required in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

The PB/SE Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Florida Diagnostic Learning and Resources Systems (FDLRS)
- Center for Autism and Related Disabilities (CARD)
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional or Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Florida Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports-Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (PBIS:MTSS)
- Office of Safe Schools
- Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)
- Florida Department of Corrections (FDOC)

This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and students with and without disabilities as they developed the strategic plan. In addition, the strategic plan, which includes this data and action steps the PB/SE team has developed, is shared with the State Advisory Committee for input.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

34

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5	42	7.69%	5.00%	11.90%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

More districts met the n-size than last year and more districts had a significant discrepancy.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A is defined as a risk ratio of three or higher when comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities

within the local educational agency. Districts are excluded from the calculation when they have fewer than 10 students with disabilities who are suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.

Numerator = risk for students with disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all students with disabilities) × 100.

Denominator = risk for students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all nondisabled students) × 100.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) reviews suspension and expulsion data for each of its districts and identifies those districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions by comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities each school year. The policies, procedures and practices involved with and governing suspensions and expulsions for students in the identified districts are reviewed, analyzed and assessed annually to ascertain what factors have contributed to the discrepancies. Through reviews and analyses, FDOE offers technical support and guidance for strategies and interventions through a multi-tiered approach to address the disproportionality.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

44

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
14	0	32	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is defined as a risk ratio of three or higher for a specific racial/ethnic group when comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities within the local educational agency. Districts are included in the calculation when they have at least two cells with more than 10 students with disabilities from a specific racial/ethnic group who are suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.

Numerator = risk for students with disabilities from a specific racial/ethnic group of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, Hispanic students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all Hispanic students with disabilities) × 100.

Denominator = risk for all students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all nondisabled students) × 100.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) reviews suspension and expulsion data for each of its districts and identifies those districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions by race and ethnicity each school year. The policies, procedures and practices involved with and governing suspensions and expulsions for students in the identified districts are reviewed, analyzed and assessed annually to ascertain what factors have contributed to the discrepancies. Through reviews and analyses, the FDOE offers technical assistance and guidance for strategies and interventions through a multi-tiered approach to address the disproportionality.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

If YES, select one of the following:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	74.00%	77.00%	79.00%	82.00%	83.00%
A	54.40%	Data	71.28%	74.44%	73.02%	73.90%	75.27%
B	2005	Target <=	11.00%	10.00%	9.00%	8.00%	7.00%
B	23.20%	Data	14.62%	12.91%	13.91%	13.77%	13.79%
C	2005	Target <=	2.25%	2.00%	1.75%	1.50%	1.25%
C	3.00%	Data	4.05%	3.92%	3.84%	3.79%	3.26%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	85.00%	85.00%
Target B <=	6.00%	6.00%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the bureau's "Best Practices for Inclusion" Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and is supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls.

This team analyzed data regarding districts' identified priorities on their required Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) self-assessment. Team members also reviewed state- and district-level data related to inclusion in relation to disability type, age, district and transitions from elementary to secondary settings.

It is important to note that the indicators are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, as well as each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts.

The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

The Best Practices for Inclusion Strategic Planning Team includes representation from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (RMTC-D/HH)
- Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
- Center for Autism & Related Disabilities (CARD)

- Project Access
- Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Network (SEDNET)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	363,720
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	273,686
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	48,542
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	9,012
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	672
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2,455

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

YES

Provide an explanation below

Private schools and Department of Corrections students are removed from this calculation

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	273,686	359,148	75.27%	85.00%	76.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	48,542	359,148	13.79%	6.00%	13.52%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	12,139	359,148	3.26%	1.00%	3.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	Florida experienced an increase of 0.12% in the percentage of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements, which is 0.02% over the allowable increase before slippage is indicated. In 2018-19, 65% of LEAs remained the same or lowered their rate of students in separate environments. 13% of LEAs increased this rate by 0.4% or more, including four large or very large LEAs, accounting for the small state-wide slippage. The Florida Inclusion Network is working with these districts to lower this number. Contributing to the increase in the number of homebound/hospital students, which has been steadily growing, and increased 9% from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	28.00%	33.00%	38.00%	43.00%	48.00%
A	29.76%	Data	28.33%	26.99%	35.83%	36.73%	40.09%
B	2011	Target <=	50.30%	49.30%	48.30%	47.30%	46.30%
B	48.89%	Data	51.24%	51.18%	49.54%	49.82%	48.54%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	50.00%	50.50%
Target B <=	45.30%	44.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input explained in the introduction, input from other stakeholders for this indicator was also received from the Prekindergarten

Strategic Planning Team, a team formed and supported by the bureau. Input was gathered through both face-to-face meetings as well as conference calls.

Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to educational environments in which children with disabilities ages 3 through 5 years are served. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results.

The Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau, the following discretionary projects and partner organizations:

- University of Miami, Measuring Outcomes
- University of Central Florida, Technical Assistance and Training System
- Florida Department Of Education (FDOE), Office of Early Learning
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS), Child Find
- University of South Florida, Student Support Services
- Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)
- Florida Department of Health (FDOH), Children's Medical Services, Early Steps
- Access Project
- Healthy Families Florida Ounce of Prevention

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	42,076
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	16,505
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	18,963
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	760
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	9

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	16,505	42,076	40.09%	50.00%	39.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	19,732	42,076	48.54%	45.30%	46.90%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	63.60%	64.60%	66.10%	68.10%	70.60%
A1	65.90%	Data	64.19%	64.92%	66.66%	69.12%	71.25%
A2	2008	Target >=	82.40%	82.90%	83.40%	83.90%	84.40%
A2	75.80%	Data	80.99%	80.42%	81.10%	81.60%	80.42%
B1	2008	Target >=	63.90%	64.90%	66.40%	68.40%	70.90%
B1	58.80%	Data	63.40%	61.93%	63.16%	65.02%	65.32%
B2	2008	Target >=	68.90%	69.90%	71.40%	73.40%	75.90%
B2	52.90%	Data	67.84%	66.46%	66.49%	67.22%	66.38%
C1	2008	Target >=	55.40%	56.40%	57.90%	59.90%	62.40%
C1	59.50%	Data	53.70%	55.63%	56.84%	61.42%	64.11%
C2	2008	Target >=	79.50%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%
C2	73.30%	Data	77.70%	77.05%	77.22%	78.42%	78.14%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	73.60%	75.10%
Target A2 >=	84.90%	85.40%
Target B1 >=	73.90%	74.40%
Target B2 >=	78.90%	79.40%
Target C1 >=	65.40%	67.40%
Target C2 >=	82.00%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Representation from the Florida Department of Education, Early Steps State Office, Local Early Steps Offices, a School District and Universities are all on a Child Outcomes advisement team.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

11,581

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	234	2.02%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,397	12.06%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	958	8.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,796	32.78%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,196	44.87%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,754	6,385	71.25%	73.60%	74.46%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	8,992	11,581	80.42%	84.90%	77.64%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	279	2.41%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2,417	20.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,400	12.09%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,963	34.22%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,522	30.41%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,363	8,059	65.32%	73.90%	66.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	7,485	11,581	66.38%	78.90%	64.63%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	234	2.02%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,739	15.02%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	701	6.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,076	26.56%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,831	50.35%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	3,777	5,750	64.11%	65.40%	65.69%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	8,907	11,581	78.14%	82.00%	76.91%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	Florida demonstrated a slippage of 2.78%. An initial analysis does not suggest a single cause for the slippage. In 2018-19, students evaluated using the norm-referenced standardized assessment Battelle Inventory 2 NU (BDI-2 NU) for determining eligibility for Exceptional Student Services (ESE) scored lower than the previous 2017-18 cohort. A portion of the 2018-19 cohort would exit in 2019, which can explain why the exit scores are lower. Additionally, the analysis indicates that the majority of the very large districts have demonstrated a decrease within the age expectation range. Florida's preschool discretionary project, Technical Assistance & Training System (TATS) will provide technical assistance in the alignment of instruction and Personal-Social delays and will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.
B1	XXX
B2	Florida demonstrated a slippage of 1.75%. An initial analysis does not suggest a single cause for the slippage. In 2018-19, students evaluated using the norm-referenced standardized assessment Battelle Inventory 2 NU (BDI-2 NU) for determining eligibility for Exceptional Student Services (ESE) scored lower than the previous 2017-18 cohort. A portion of the 2018-19 cohort would exit in 2019, which can explain why the exit scores are lower. Additionally, the analysis indicates that the majority of the very large districts have demonstrated a decrease within the age expectation range. Florida's preschool discretionary project, (TATS) will provide technical assistance in the alignment of instruction and communication delays and will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.
C1	XXX
C2	Florida demonstrated a slippage of 1.23%. An initial analysis does not suggest a single cause for the slippage. In 2018-19, students evaluated using the norm-referenced standardized assessment Battelle Inventory 2 NU (BDI-2 NU) for determining eligibility for Exceptional Student Services (ESE) scored lower than the previous 2017-18 cohort. A portion of the 2018-19 cohort would exit in 2019, which can explain why the exit scores are lower. Additionally, the analysis indicates that the majority of the very large districts have demonstrated a decrease within the age expectation range. Florida's preschool discretionary project, (TATS) will provide technical assistance in the alignment of instruction and Adaptive delays and will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

The criteria used for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" was a standard score of 78 or above, that is, >-1.5 SD. The instrument used was the Battelle Development Inventory, Second Edition. The procedure used to gather the data was individual administration of the BDI-2 when children entered the prekindergarten program and when they exited the program. Only children who participated in the program for at least 6 months were included. Use of the BDI-2 Screening Test instead of the full assessment was permissible under specific circumstances for using the BDI-2 Screening Test described in the state's Child Outcomes Measurement System guidance documents.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-2) is used to assess children on program entry and program exit. Data from assessments conducted by PreK personnel (or, for some entry assessments, obtained from a partnering Local Early Steps program) are entered into the BDI-2 Data Manager, a proprietary online scoring system. The data are downloaded from the Data Manager and analyzed through a discretionary project funded by the FDOE. Students' scores from the Personal-Social domain are used to address Outcome A; scores from the Communication domain are used to address Outcome B; and scores from the Adaptive domain are used to address Outcome C.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to parent involvement and engagement, including the percentage of parents who report that schools partnered with them. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results.

The Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau and from the following department areas and partner organizations:

- Florida Department of Education, Independent Education and Parental Choice
 - Family Network on Disabilities- OSEP's federally funded parent center
 - Florida Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)
 - Piedra Data Systems
 - State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)
 - Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
 - Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources Center (FDLRS)
 - Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
 - Project 10: Transition Education Network
 - University of Miami's Exceptional Student Education Parent Survey Project
 - Parents of students with disabilities
 - Parents of the Panhandle Information Network (POPIN) - Federally funded parent training and information center
 - Parent Education Network- Federally funded parent training and information center
- Bureau staff members and school district personnel all provided input, including staff from the following partner organizations, discretionary projects and advisory committees:
- The State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students
 - State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee
 - The Family Café
 - Parent to Parent (of Miami) - Federally funded parent training and information center
 - Florida Developmental Disability Council

Historical Data

Baseline	XXX	XXX			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent parents

XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

XXX

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	2008	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%
Preschool	43.00%	Data	73.19%	72.18%	73.02%	73.33%	73.33%
School age	2008	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%
School age	32.00%	Data	75.63%	74.31%	77.05%	77.73%	77.74%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	85.00%	85.00%
Target B >=	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	3,799	4,564	73.33%	85.00%	83.24%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
School age	30,314	37,871	77.74%	85.00%	80.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

391,760

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

10.83%

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Florida invites all parents of students receiving special education services to contribute their perceptions of schools' efforts to promote their involvement. Florida has vastly increased the number of parents who have participated in the annual Indicator 8 survey. This year's total of 42,435 respondents includes substantial representation of all racial/ethnic groups, grade levels, and categories of exceptionality. The state has determined that parent responses are representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	75	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Florida defines "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher using the Westats risk ratio method for calculating disproportionate representation. The minimum cell size is 10 and minimum "n" size is 30. One district was excluded from all the calculations due to a total population of students with disabilities of less than 30.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Not Applicable.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	75	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Florida defines "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for three consecutive years using the Westats risk ratio method. The state has established a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum "n" size of 30 in calculating the risk ratio when determining disproportionate representation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

The process for determining whether disproportionate representation of a particular racial or ethnic group is the result of inappropriate identification includes analysis of the district's risk index in comparison to the state risk index for that group; patterns and trends in the risk index and risk ratio over time to identify patterns and progress in addressing disproportionate representation; review of policies and procedures (SP&P) document submitted to the FDOE electronically; and, the results of On-site and Desk-top monitoring of all districts identified with disproportionate representation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

All districts with disproportionate representation for more than one year must participate in either on-site and desk-top monitoring activities conducted by Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services. Department personnel collaborate with district personnel to review district data, identify root causes of over-identification, and facilitate the district's development of an action plan to address root causes and decrease disproportionate representation. Policies, procedures, and practices are addressed in Focus groups and in the district action plan developed during the on-site visit or desk-top monitoring. Districts identified with significant disproportionality must submit a plan that addresses the root causes of disproportionality and the strategies and allocation of funding used to reduce disproportionate representation and outcomes .

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	92.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.58%	98.10%	97.05%	96.84%	97.81%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
70,962	69,113	97.81%	100%	97.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

1,849

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

There was a total of 1,849 initial evaluations completed beyond the 60-day evaluation timeline.

1-10 days beyond = 664
 11-20 days beyond = 336
 Beyond 21 days = 849

The primary reason for any delays in completing evaluations within the 60-day evaluation timeline was due to a 9% increase in parental consents for an initial evaluation with no increase in staffing ratios for school psychologists and speech-language pathologists to conduct evaluations. The shortage of specialized instructional support personnel continues to be a major factor contributing to evaluation delays. Florida's school psychology to student ratio of 1:1960 is almost four times the ratio recommended by the National Association of School Psychologists. Even given these constraints, 5,648 more evaluations were completed within the timeline than in the previous year, which reflects an increase of 9%. Other factors contributing to delays in meeting the evaluation timeline include assignment of specialized instructional support personnel to address mental health and safety in schools, including the provision of threat assessments and suicide risk assessments, vacancies and medical leave of evaluation specialists, failure to notify the evaluation specialist of the request, and student mobility.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Initial evaluations must be completed within 60 calendar days after the school district receives parental consent for an evaluation. School holidays, Thanksgiving, winter, and spring breaks, and summer vacation days are excluded from the 60-day count.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The department developed a web-based application, IDEA Indicator 11 Data, which is accessed through the Department of Education Single Sign On platform. Districts enter the number of parental consents obtained and the number of evaluations completed within and beyond the evaluation time frame. The application auto-calculates totals and percentage of evaluations completed with the 60-day timeline. When the number of consents and completed evaluations does not match, the district must provide a brief explanation for each student and the anticipated completion date in a pop-up dialogue box.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
35	35		0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State's verification of the correction of each district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance with the state established evaluation timeline) is based on the state's review of updated data. Subsequent to the findings, the State randomly sampled initial evaluations completed during the 2018-19 school year. The State pulls random samples of initial evaluations completed in a given month until the district sample demonstrates 100 percent compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1). Results of random sample reviews (i.e., student information, consent date, evaluation due date and evaluation completion date) documented that the districts below 100% compliance in FFY 2017 are currently completing initial evaluations consistent with the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance by requiring districts to submit the evaluation completion date for each student whose evaluation was completed after the district submission of 2017-18 data or by providing documentation that the student was exempt from the initial evaluation timeline (e.g., student left the district's jurisdiction prior to completion of the evaluation) for each student whose evaluation had not been completed when the district submitted the initial evaluation timeline data. Districts provided documentation of the evaluation completion date for each of the individual cases of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	32.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	8,105
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	202
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6,971

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	430
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	502
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6,971	6,971	99.90%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

0

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Using survey 5 (all year enrollment) and survey 2 (October enrollment) from the student information database obtained from FDOE's Education Information and Accountability Services office. FDOE matches the data file from FDOH Early Steps with survey 5 data files. Once survey 2 is available, the FDOE repeats the matching process. Finally, FDOE unduplicates all matching records. FDOE sends districts the resulting data sets for review and data verification. Specifically, districts are asked to verify the child's enrollment in the district, dates of eligibility determination, eligibility status and IEP dates. Districts must code records for all children who are not located in the FDOE student information database or do not have eligibility of the IEP dates on or before their third birthday. Upon completion of the data review and verification process, districts return the final data sets to FDOE for processing. FDOE uses the final data sets to calculate Indicator 12(a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). It calculates a final compliance percentage using the following formula: $[c \div (a - b - d - e)] \times 100$.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The correction requires a district to demonstrate 100% compliance with the transition timeline. Districts will, once notified of noncompliance based on their 2017 -18 data, began a monthly sampling (starting with March 2019) of five children who were transitioned during that month to determine if they are in compliance. As soon as a sample of children reflects 100% compliance, the district may stop sampling and report their findings to the bureau. Once the bureau has verified the district reported findings, the correction of noncompliance was completed.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

When a district, through the monthly sampling process, determines 100% compliance has been reached, information must be provided to Florida Department of Education (FDOE), via e-mail in the following format. Children's names are e-mailed as child 1, child 2, etc.

Child Date of Birth IEP Date
Child 1

In order to verify the information submitted, FDOE staff will contact the district by phone and request names for two of the five reported children. The information provided by the district about these two students will be compared to the information submitted to the state through the automated student database.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	82.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.77%	90.55%	90.38%	94.84%	90.40%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
549	574	90.40%	100%	95.64%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

BEESS, FDOE implements a statewide monitoring self-assessment system, which includes Indicator 13. A sampling plan identifies the number of student records to be reviewed, as well as any criteria that must be applied when selecting student records. BEESS staff validates the accuracy of data obtained from the districts' self-assessments through a desk review of student records.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
55	55	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The State provides training and technical assistance to assist LEAs to correctly implement the regulatory requirements. LEAs with noncompliance are required to submit subsequent samples until they achieve a sample that demonstrated 100 percent compliance.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

Each LEA with noncompliance provided updated IEPs to demonstrate the correction of each individual case of noncompliance. These records were reviewed by the State and found to be compliant.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%	35.00%	37.00%
A	27.00%	Data	28.35%	28.63%	28.48%	27.84%	24.30%
B	2009	Target >=	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%
B	37.00%	Data	42.14%	43.67%	43.18%	43.84%	50.55%
C	2009	Target >=	54.00%	57.00%	60.00%	63.00%	66.00%
C	50.00%	Data	53.81%	55.74%	54.91%	56.16%	58.76%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	39.00%	41.00%
Target B >=	52.00%	53.00%
Target C >=	69.00%	72.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Stakeholder input for Indicator 14 is identical to stakeholder input for Indicator 1. For Indicator 14, transition stakeholder groups had direct input in choosing the targets.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	17,800
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	4,554
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	5,242
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	384
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1,029

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	4,554	17,800	24.30%	39.00%	25.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	9,796	17,800	50.55%	52.00%	55.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	11,209	17,800	58.76%	69.00%	62.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), established by Section 1008.39, Florida Statutes to provide follow-up data on all exiters of all public education or training programs in Florida, is used to search for all exiting students in postschool settings. FETPIP does not sample or use a survey procedure to collect these data. It is a data collection and consumer reporting system, using a technique referred to as "record linkage," a computerized process which combines individually identifiable data from several different administrative data bases. The purpose of the linkage is to develop aggregate statistics that describe the experiences of student groups or participants after exiting an education or training program. The aggregates are used to produce outcome performance measures that are intended to assist in evaluating the success of educational programs. More information about FETPIP may be found at <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/fl-edu-training-placement-info-program>. As this robust data system

looks for information on all students, not just a sampling, and is not predicated on surveying and survey responses, the data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	108
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	100

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The development of Florida's SPP is the responsibility of strategic plan teams that include staff from the FDOE, staff from discretionary projects funded by the FDOE (including district- and school-level representation) and from other agencies. Each team includes individuals with expertise pertinent to the indicator.

Florida's State Advisory Committee has also been a critical stakeholder group for the development of the SPP and APR. A draft of the initial targets was provided to this group and input was taken. Those recommendations were also shared with the strategic plan teams, and revisions to the targets were made, if

necessary. The advisory committee contains a majority of members who are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. In addition, the

committee has representatives that are appointed by the governor, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other state agencies involved in financing or delivery of related services to

children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter schools, a representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for

foster care, and representatives from the state juvenile and adult corrections agencies.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	57.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	55.00%	72.50%	73.00%	74.00%	74.50%

Data	59.09%	70.59%	79.66%	29.63%	97.22%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%	75.50%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
100	108	97.22%	75.00%	92.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	42
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	18

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

YES

Provide an explanation below

The data for mediation agreements not related to due process complaints (2.1.b.i) was corrected for FFY2018 SPP/APR from 18 to 22, which will be resubmitted during the correction period beginning, May 1.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Stakeholder input for Indicator 16 is identical to stakeholder input for Indicator 15. For Indicator 16, Dispute Resolution and Monitoring strategic plan team

and stakeholder groups had direct input in choosing the targets.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	79.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	66.20%	68.20%	70.20%	72.20%	74.20%
Data	52.17%	55.56%	60.53%	66.67%	72.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.00%	75.50%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	22	42	72.00%	75.00%	69.05%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As Florida's districts, parents and guardians become more aware of the dispute resolution options available through various technical assistance offered by the state, the use of these options increase. For example, the total number of state complaints filed increased by 33 for year 2018-19. Additionally, utilization of Florida's state facilitated individual educational plan option has increased from 17-18 to 18-19. Mediation requests also increased by 29 requests for year 2018-19, mainly as a result of higher numbers of meditations held not related to due process as stakeholders increased their utilization of this alternative method of dispute resolution. This means that for the most part Florida is experiencing an increasing number of the most difficult cases that have already been through several alternative resolution and litigious routes utilizing mediation outside of due process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dr. Monica Verra-Tirado

Title:

Bureau Chief of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Email:

monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org

Phone:

8502450941

Submitted on: