

# GA Part B

# FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

#### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

211

#### General Supervision System:

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

The Division for Special Education Services and Supports at the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) implemented an effective system of General Supervision to complete the following tasks: (1) Support practices that improve educational results and functional outcomes; (2) Use multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance within one year; and (3) Use mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and to enforce compliance. The GADOE's system for General Supervision included eight components; (1) State Performance Plan, (2) Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation, (3) Integrated Monitoring Activities, (4) Fiscal Management, (5) Data on Processes and Results, (6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions, (7) Effective Dispute Resolution and (8) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development.

The Division provided appropriate accountability to ensure that Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) complied with federal regulations. Fidelity of compliant practices was enforced by using a tiered monitoring system that enabled the Division staff to "monitor" all LEAs every year. Monitoring can be defined as "a continuing function or operation that uses systematic collection and analysis of data on specified indicators to provide management and stakeholders with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of targets and progress in continuous improvement."

The Division monitors each district every year to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the Division conducts a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. As the tiers ascend, there is increased intensity in the review of data. LEAs are targeted for each tier based either on data or the Division's monitoring cycle.

Tier 1 monitoring procedures were implemented for all LEAs in the state to enforce compliance and improve results. Tier 1 activities include a review of District Determination Data, District Summary of APR Activities, District Improvement Activities, Continuation of Services Data, Fiscal Risk Assessment, Data Validation Checks and Dispute Resolution Data.

Tier 2 monitoring procedures were consistently implemented for a targeted group of LEAs based on data.

Tier 3 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs and differentiated to meet their compliance and/or performance needs, which were triggered by the previous tier's data or the Division's monitoring cycle. In most instances, Tier 3 monitoring activities were conducted onsite. Records Reviews may be an onsite activity or online if the LEA is participating in the Georgia Online IEP system. The monitoring activities at Tiers 2 and 3 provide the Division with documentation to review district level policies, procedures, and practices.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any LEAs that demonstrated difficulty in timely correcting noncompliance. Based on the review of data from these components, the Division ensured timely identification and correction of noncompliance that ultimately fostered a "continuous improvement monitoring process." Below is an explanation for several of the monitoring activities.

*Record Reviews* - The Division for Special Education Services and Supports conducted Record Reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for LEAs. The Division reviewed records from all LEAs which included IEPs and transition plans.

*Fiscal Monitoring* - Monitoring of federal programs is conducted to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. Cross Functional Monitoring emphasizes accountability for

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

using federal resources wisely. Monitoring serves as a vehicle for the Georgia Department of Education to help LEAs achieve high quality implementation of educational programs utilizing the LEAs' federal allocations.

LEAs are monitored on a four-year cycle (approximately 1/4 each year). However, some LEAs may be monitored more frequently such as those LEAs that are deemed High Risk or other reasons the GADOE may think necessary. Risk assessment is completed to determine if an LEA falls into the high-risk category. The Department's Office of Federal Programs defines high-risk as:

- LEAs showing evidence of serious or chronic compliance problems
- LEAs with previous financial monitoring/audit findings
- LEAs with a high number of complaints from parents and other stakeholders about program implementation
- Other LEAs as deemed necessary

Each Federal Program has indicators for which that program will be monitored. The Uniform Grant's Guidance, along with other pertinent federal regulations, guides the fiscal monitoring process of Cross Functional Monitoring. All other indicators for each program could be fiscal or programmatic in nature.

*Data Verifications and Audits* - The Division for Special Education selected a sampling of LEAs to provide data verification based on certain risk factors. In these instances, the LEAs provided appropriate documentation to support valid and accurate data reporting practices. Although some monitoring procedures are in place for all LEAs, this level of verification impacted a target group of LEAs.

*Dispute Resolution* - The Division for Special Education provided desk audits to resolve issues of noncompliance as a part of the implementation of the dispute resolution processes. These data and documentation were used to support identification and/or correction of noncompliance for LEAs identified through a complaint investigation or a due process hearing.

*Disproportionality Compliance Review* - The Division for Special Education required the Compliance Review protocol for all LEAs identified as having some type of disproportionality determination. The Division reviewed these data and other pertinent documentation to identify noncompliance.

*Timeline Reviews* - Timeline summary reports are submitted as a part of the required publicly reported data to the Division for Special Education. Each LEA submits a summary of its performance in meeting requirements for timely completion of evaluation/eligibility for initial referrals to special education, and timely transition of young children from Babies Can't Wait (Part C) to special education (Part B). These data for the fiscal year (July 1 – June 30) are reported by July 31 each year.

The following link provides additional information regarding Georgia's General Supervision processes:

<http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia%27s-Continuous-Improvement-Monitoring-Process-%28GCIMP%29.aspx>

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**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.

The Division for Special Education Services and Supports has made technical assistance (TA) a priority to facilitate program improvement throughout the state that is linked to the indicators and improvement activities as outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the correction of noncompliance.

The GADOE's comprehensive approach to TA enables the Division to differentiate the scope of services provided for local education agencies (LEAs) based on local needs. TA provides a framework for LEAs to build their capacity for general supervision. Basic TA is a facilitation for change and includes providing documentation of evidence-based practices and disseminating examples of success to assist others in planning, implementation and use of tools to achieve positive outcomes. TA ranges from general levels, such as the Division providing an overview or review of best practices, to Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA), more intense support.

TA available for all LEAs includes monthly meetings with LEA staff, webinars to support implementation of the IDEA, weekly updates via email, monthly directors' webinars, the Special Education Implementation Manual, and sample special education forms.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) includes more focused levels of support such as the GADOE directing root cause analysis and monitoring of Corrective Action Plan (CAP) development and correction. TTA may also include assistance with data analysis, improvement planning, and identification of promising practices, training in identified needs, and other requests for resources that would facilitate program change. Successful TTA requires an ongoing negotiated and collaborative relationship. TTA leads to a purposeful, planned series of activities that results in changes to policy, program, or operations that support increased capacity at the state, LEA, and school levels.

To achieve these outcomes, the collaboration often includes the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), local colleges and universities and our national partners, to provide additional technical assistance to LEAs.

The Collaborative Communities approach is a technical assistance model in which stakeholders are engaged in solving critical problems and supporting each other in their efforts. Participants share common roles, responsibilities, and/or desired outcomes. They deepen their knowledge and expertise by sharing information, materials, and resources. These groups utilize focused action and shared leadership to work together to accomplish common goals.

To support the state in addressing its needs assistance status, Georgia has continued to strengthen its relationship with Technical Assistance Centers including the Idea Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DASY), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). A team from Georgia attended the Part B Cross State Learning Collaborative. Information and resources from this conference have informed the work of the SSIP regarding all aspects of improving the graduation rate for students with disabilities. Tools and resources available from IDC are used to assist in data analysis. Georgia has also collaborated with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**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.

Professional Development (PD) may be at a basic level of providing general information to a more targeted and intensive level of learning which is job-embedded and data-driven focused on student achievement and school improvement.

Research suggests that to build capacity, a framework that includes understanding the stages of change process must be used. The stages of change are: Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and Sustainability and Innovation. This requires that a system commit to a multi-year process of improvement.

The Division of Special Education Services collaborates with many partners at the national, regional, state, and local levels to provide timely and accurate information about available professional development in special education. These collaborations often include the national technical assistance centers, the University of Kansas Transition Center (KU), the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) and local colleges and universities.

The Division's professional development incorporates many factors including the model and delivery method (job-related or job-embedded) that will be followed and the type of training. In addition, the professional development is generally self-directed, based on previous experience, relevant to the needs and applicable to the specific situation. It is based on data that answers the question "who needs to know what" at the district, administrative, school or specialist's level. The various delivery models for professional development include webinars, training module series, videos and face to face conferencing.

Some examples of these can be found at:

- Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: ( <https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx> )
- Professional Learning Resources for Teacher and Leader Effectiveness: ( <http://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-for-Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness.aspx> )
- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Professional Development Videos: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum->

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education’s (GADOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GADOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development of Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as we have sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2018 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following members.

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district Special Education Directors
- GADOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP has representatives from:

- The Department of Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can’t Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents’ Association

The State Director for special education conducts listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director’s Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for graduation and academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup. Georgia’s methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR is similar to the methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia’s College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia’s ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

The GADOE provides data regarding students with disabilities in our state. The Annual Performance Report is posted on the Special Education webpage at the following link: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-%28SPP%29%2c-Annual-Performance-Reports-%28APR%29-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx> Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and also previous years.

School districts' public reports of the APR is also available for public viewing. These documents can be found at the following link: [LEA Annual Performance Reports](#)

The user must enter a zip code of the school district or type the name of school district they would like to view.

In addition to the Annual Performance Reports, Georgia's website contains links to SEA, LEA and School Level Assessment data (suppressed at cell size of 15). SEA Discipline data, Exiting data, Federal Child Count data, Environment data, and Personnel data are also posted. The following is a link to these data: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

### OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

### 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.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%		35.70%	47.40%	53.20%
Data		32.40%	32.93%	37.74%	41.40%	44.38%	43.30%	35.20%	35.20%	35.09%	36.50%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	54.00%	54.50%
Data	54.33%	56.59%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	57.60%	58.85%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

Georgia is aligning targets for students with disabilities reporting in the APR with the targets set for students with disabilities in the ESSA plan. The baseline year in Georgia's ESSA plan is FFY16, the year being reported in this APR. The methodology is:  $(100\% - \text{baseline year data}) \times .03 = \% \text{ increase for each year}$ . The target = Baseline year + the percent increase.

The methodology for setting the targets for graduation was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Georgia has received approval for its Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan, which includes targets for graduation for all students including students with disabilities. The targets for the APR were set to mirror targets outlined in the ESSA plan. The methodology is:  $(100\% - \text{baseline year data}) \times .03 = \% \text{ increase for each year}$ . The baseline year in Georgia's ESSA plan is FFY2016 data.

The methodology for setting the targets for graduation was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. The State Advisory Panel provided feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

During the interim, stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the Indicators and the targets. During 2017-2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, provided feedback, as well. At least annually, stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes. In addition, the Division for Special Education posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	8,344	7978
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	14,177	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	58.86%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Georgia resubmitted FY17 graduation data (SY 2016-2017 EDFacts file spec C150) with revised data. Georgia was asked to remove the graduates who were assessed on an alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards because the State did not develop a State-Identified Alternate Diploma. The overwrite reflects the revised data.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
 FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
7,978	14,177	56.59%	57.60%	56.27%

**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

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.

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) holds high expectations for all students and works to raise the graduation rate of students with Individual Education Programs (IEP) who receive regular education diplomas. The GaDOE supports improved instructional programs and access to the general curriculum for all students. Georgia defines a graduate as a student who exits high school with a Regular High School Diploma (not a Certificate of Attendance or Special Education Diploma) in the standard time of 4 years. Graduates must have met course and assessment criteria. Georgia offers one diploma for all students. The links below provide information for the assessment and graduation requirements:

- Testing: (<http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/State-Board-of-Education/SBOE%20Rules/160-3-1-.07.pdf>)
- Graduation: (<http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/AskDOE/Pages/Graduation-Requirements.aspx>)

Georgia is reporting data from the **2016-2017 school year**. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), the adjusted cohort graduation rate. Georgia is reporting a **2016-2017** 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 56.27% for Students with IEPs in the SPP/APR submitted in February 2019.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			5.70%	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.90%	5.90%
Data		6.10%	5.77%	5.27%	5.80%	5.50%	5.80%	6.15%	6.00%	5.68%	5.90%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	5.80%	5.70%
Data	5.60%	5.60%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.60%	5.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018, and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.**

- Option 1
- Option 2

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?  No

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Total number of students with IEPs in high school that dropped out	Total number of students with IEPs enrolled in high school.	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
3,781	65,921	5.60%	5.60%	5.74%

**Use a different calculation methodology**

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

The dropout rate calculation is the same for students with and without disabilities. The State used the dropout data for FFY2016 which used 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.

The calculation is the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 9-12 with a withdrawal code corresponding to a dropout divided by the number of SWD in grades 9-12.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

A student is considered a dropout when the student withdraws from school with a withdrawal code corresponding to one of the following reasons: Marriage, Expelled, Financial Hardship/Job, Incarcerated/Under Jurisdiction of Juvenile or Criminal Justice Authority, Low Grades/School Failure, Military, Adult Education/Postsecondary, Pregnant/Parent, Removed for Lack of Attendance, Serious Illness/Accident, and Unknown.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

### Reasons for Slippage

Georgia continues to be challenged by the number of students with disabilities who exit high school as a dropout. Many LEAs report that they are "losing students" so they may work and contribute to their family's income. The LEAs will be continuing to determine the true root cause for the increased number of students with disabilities who exit as dropouts. Of note, the number of students without disabilities who exit as dropouts is also increasing. Much of the SSIP work in Georgia is focused on school climate, engaging students in their learning, and improving opportunities for students to receive a regular education diploma, thus decreasing the number of students who dropout of school. Also, the GADOE has launched training and implementation of Check and Connect, the only research validated program to increase retention of students in school, decreasing the number of students who drop out. The GADOE is also working to improve the quality of transition planning and services, which will also encourage students to stay in school.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.54%	98.54%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		98.90%	98.40%	98.40%
			Data		98.82%	99.40%	99.14%	99.17%	99.31%	99.80%	98.70%	98.40%	99.18%	98.18%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.53%	98.53%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		97.70%	97.70%	97.70%
			Data		98.82%	99.12%	99.11%	99.19%	99.30%	99.26%	98.00%	97.70%	98.95%	97.10%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.45%	98.45%
		Data	99.14%	99.13%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	97.75%	97.75%
		Data	99.43%	98.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.50%	98.75%
Math	A ≥ Overall	97.80%	98.25%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	124,946	123,562	99.13%	98.50%	98.89%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	139,307	137,303	98.83%	97.80%	98.56%

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Public Reporting Information

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

The GADOE annually reports to the public the results of our state assessments for students with disabilities. Assessment data are reported at the State level, the local school district level and the school level. Data at the school level are suppressed at a cell size of 15. The data are available on the Special Education webpage at the following link titled Federal Data Reports: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>. These documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of the Part B SPP/APR on February 1, 2019. In addition to these reports, the LEA level assessment data is available on each school district's public report of their SPP/APR. This document reports data for each LEA on all the APR indicators, including assessment (3b and 3c). These documents can be found at the following link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatId=ALL&T=0&FY=2017>. The user must select the school district they would like to view and then select 'special education'. The user may also be required to toggle to the correct year to view the most recent APR data.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Elementary/ Middle	2016	Target ≥						69.00%	70.00%		79.50%	81.60%	16.77%
			Data						70.11%	73.90%	80.40%	81.10%	82.12%	16.77%
	B HS	2016	Target ≥									62.70%	66.40%	12.28%
			Data								61.70%	63.20%	64.45%	12.28%
Math	A Elementary/ Middle	2016	Target ≥						55.00%	56.00%		69.80%	72.90%	15.42%
			Data						54.23%	64.00%	64.70%	65.40%	63.69%	15.42%
	B HS	2016	Target ≥									37.70%	10.30%	11.07%
			Data								31.50%	37.60%	17.69%	11.07%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Elementary/ Middle	Target ≥	16.87%	17.66%
		Data	16.89%	17.66%
	B HS	Target ≥	12.30%	15.73%
		Data	13.34%	15.73%
Math	A Elementary/ Middle	Target ≥	15.90%	19.97%
		Data	19.14%	19.97%
	B HS	Target ≥	11.57%	11.59%
		Data	12.51%	11.59%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	20.13%	22.60%
	B ≥ HS	18.25%	20.78%
Math	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	22.37%	24.77%
	B ≥ HS	14.25%	16.90%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Georgia has received approval for its Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup.

Georgia's methodology to calculate achievement targets for the APR is similar to the methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

In August 2018, November 2018, and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, provided feedback, as well. At least annually, stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes. In addition, the Division for Special Education posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 3/28/2019

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	18626	19336	20073	18573	17666	16664	105	1487	10129	903	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1583	1385	1136	695	489	457	n	32	311	16	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	826	1027	1001	709	706	955	n	67	651	33	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1449	1556	1553	1568	1636	1741			1437		

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 3/28/2019

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	18609	19316	20059	18550	17620	16655	10190	11043	4534	735	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2123	1721	1160	731	696	607	414	391	11	n	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1432	1718	1124	849	1145	1077	694	762	68	11	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1492	1562	1598	1487	1666	1780			1321		

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	110,938	20,472	17.66%	20.13%	18.45%
B HS	12,624	2,553	15.73%	18.25%	20.22%

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	110,801	23,969	19.97%	22.37%	21.63%
B HS	26,502	3,675	11.59%	14.25%	13.87%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Public Reporting Information**

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

The GADOE annually reports to the public the results of our state assessments for students with disabilities. Assessment data are reported at the State level, the local school district level and the school level. Data at the school level are suppressed at a cell size of 15. The data are available on the Special Education web-page at the following link titled Federal Data Reports: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx> These documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of the Part B SPP/APR on February 1, 2019. In addition to these reports, the LEA level assessment data is available on each school district's public report of their SPP/APR. This document reports data for each LEA on all the APR indicators, including assessment (3b and 3c). These documents can be found at the following link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatId=ALL&T=0&FY=2017>. The user must select the school district they would like to view and then select 'special education'. The user may also be required to toggle to the correct year to view the most recent APR data.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

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; and
- 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2015

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.37%	3.83%	3.83%	3.28%	3.28%	10.00%	9.50%	4.50%	4.40%
Data		6.56%	4.89%	0.54%	0.54%	0%	10.22%	5.21%	3.00%	4.50%	2.53%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	18.52%	17.50%
Data	18.52%	18.52%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	16.50%	15.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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. 200

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
4	7	18.52%	16.50%	57.14%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Georgia is reporting data for Indicator 4a that represents significant slippage. The Measurement Table requires a calculation that includes in the denominator only the LEAs that met the n size. 200 of our 207 LEAs did not suspend children with disabilities out of school for greater than 10 days and therefore are not included in the denominator. Only 7 LEAs suspended children with disabilities out of school for more than 10 days and will be included in the denominator. This represents 20 fewer LEAs than last year. Four of the 7 LEAs that did suspend children with disabilities had significant discrepancy. Georgia views this as progress as fewer LEAs are suspending children with disabilities out of school for more than 10 days.

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- 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



*Georgia's Definition of Significant Discrepancy:* The rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities (SWD) for greater than 10 days in a school year was defined as: (1) a suspension N-Size (now referred to as the cell size)  $\geq 5$  and (2) a suspension/expulsion rate ratio  $\geq 2.0$  for 2015-2016 and  $\geq 2.0$  for 2016-2017.

**Calculation for Significant Discrepancy:**

(((LEA # of SWD ages 6-21 with greater than 10 days Out-of-School Suspension (OSS))

Divided by (LEA Total SWD Age 6 - 21))

Divided by

(State # of SWD ages 6-21 with greater than 10 days OSS Divided by State SWD Age 6-21))

**Georgia's Comparison Methodology:** Georgia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) among Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The number of LEAs in the state changes annually based on the addition and removal of charter LEAs. This indicator reports the number of LEAs for the 2016-2017 school year (FFY16). For FFY16, Georgia had 207 LEAs. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 207 LEAs, 7 of which met the n-size.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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.

Based on 2016-2017 data, 5 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The State required the districts to complete a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. Each district convened a compliance Review team to rate the district's performance. Districts were required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Areas of the Compliance Review. The State required each district with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area. As a result of this verification, 1 out of the 5 districts was identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy.

For the district identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

- 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 DID 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 DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.

Based on 2016-2017 data, 5 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The State required the districts to complete a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. Each district convened a compliance Review team to rate the district's performance. Districts were required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Areas of the Compliance Review. The State required each district with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area. As a result of this verification, 1 out of the 5 districts was identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy.

For the district identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

### OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2017 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance 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; and
- 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.53%	2.15%	0.52%	4.10%	1.50%	1.52%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	5.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

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. 196

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
7	2	11	5.00%	0%	18.18%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Georgia is reporting data for Indicator 4b that represents significant slippage. The Measurement Table requires a calculation that includes in the denominator only the LEAs that met the n size. 196 of our 207 LEAs did not suspend children with disabilities out of school for greater than 10 days and therefore are not included in the denominator. Eleven LEAs are included in the denominator. This represents 9 fewer LEAs that last year. Seven of the 11 LEAs that did suspend children with disabilities had significant discrepancy. Of the 7 with significant discrepancy only 2 did not have policies, practices and procedures that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Georgia views this as progress as fewer LEAs are suspending children with disabilities out of school for more than 10 days.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

**Georgia's Definition of Significant Discrepancy:** The rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities (SWD), by race and ethnicity, for greater than 10 days in a school year was defined as: (1) a suspension n-size (now referred to as the cell)  $\geq 5$  and (2) a suspension/expulsion rate ratio  $\geq 2.0$  for 2015-2016 and  $\geq 2.0$  for 2016-2017.

**Calculation for Significant Discrepancy:**

$$\frac{[(\text{LEA \# of SWD ages 6-21, by race and ethnicity, with greater than 10 days Out of School Suspension (OSS)}) \text{ Divided by } (\text{LEA Total SWD ages 6-21, by race and ethnicity})]}{\text{Divided by } ((\text{State \# of SWD ages 6-21 with greater than 10 days OSS}) \text{ Divided by } (\text{State SWD Age 6-21}))}$$

**Georgia's Comparison Methodology:** Georgia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) among Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of LEAs in the state changes annually based on the addition and removal of charter LEAs. This indicator reports the number of LEAs for the 2016-2017 school year (FFY16). For FFY16, Georgia had 207 LEAs. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 207 LEAs, 11 of which met the n-size.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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.

Based on 2016-2017 data, 1 district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that was the result inappropriate policies, practices and procedures. The State required the district to complete a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. The district convened a compliance Review team to rate the district's performance. The district was required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Areas of the Compliance Review. The State required the district with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area.

The district was identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

- 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 DID 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 DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.

Based on 2016-2017 data, 1 district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that was the result inappropriate policies, practices and procedures. The State required the district to complete a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. The district convened a compliance Review team to rate the district's performance. The district was required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Areas of the Compliance Review. The State required the district with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area.

The district was identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

#### FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The districts were required to create Corrective Action Plans (CAP) that addressed the noncompliance and revision of policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancy. The implementation of the CAP was monitored monthly by the Division staff.

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

The State identified eight districts with significant discrepancy by race. The State required the 8 districts to convene district level teams to complete the Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports or procedural safeguards. After providing a review of the districts' policies, practices, and procedures, the State made a finding of noncompliance for 3 of the 8 districts. The noncompliant districts demonstrated noncompliant practices as they related to the following areas: (1) Development and implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), (2) Appropriate use of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and (3) Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. The districts received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2017 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			57.00%	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%	65.00%	67.00%	65.00%	65.10%
		Data		54.30%	55.43%	60.00%	61.00%	61.83%	62.70%	63.74%	64.60%	64.88%	64.87%
B	2005	Target ≤			19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%	14.50%	14.40%
		Data		19.40%	19.66%	16.70%	16.40%	15.63%	15.07%	14.78%	14.60%	14.50%	14.56%
C	2005	Target ≤			0.90%	0.90%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	2.00%	1.80%
		Data		1.40%	1.62%	1.91%	2.00%	2.42%	2.32%	2.26%	2.40%	2.02%	2.13%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	65.20%	65.30%
	Data	64.89%	64.46%
B	Target ≤	14.30%	14.20%
	Data	15.04%	15.11%
C	Target ≤	1.70%	1.60%
	Data	2.07%	1.97%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.40%	65.50%
Target B ≤	14.10%	14.00%
Target C ≤	1.50%	1.38%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	195,434	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	125,203	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	29,706	null

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	2,550	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	431	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	483	null

ED does not accept the data provided by the State

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	125,203	195,434	64.46%	65.40%	64.06%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29,706	195,434	15.11%	14.10%	15.20%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,464	195,434	1.97%	1.50%	1.77%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									47.00%	45.60%	45.80%
		Data								46.00%	45.50%	45.57%	44.22%
B	2011	Target ≤									21.00%	24.40%	24.00%
		Data								22.60%	24.20%	24.37%	24.07%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	46.00%	46.20%
	Data	43.98%	42.95%
B	Target ≤	23.00%	23.50%
	Data	24.65%	25.82%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	46.40%	46.60%
Target B ≤	23.00%	22.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	18,833	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">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</a>	7,899	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	5,103	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	64	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,899	18,833	42.95%	46.40%	41.94%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,167	18,833	25.82%	23.00%	27.44%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Reasons for A Slippage**

The Preschool Environment data for 6a indicates slippage for Georgia. Georgia does not have universal preschool for 3 and 4-year-old children. LEAs are challenged to find a general education setting for young children, especially those who are 3 years old. Many of our LEAs are providing high quality services for young children with disabilities; the services for many children are often provided outside of the general education setting as there are a limited number of settings in which to include young children.

**Reasons for B Slippage**

The Preschool Environment data for 6b indicates slippage for Georgia. Georgia does not have universal preschool 3 and 4-year-old children. LEAs are challenged to find a general education setting for young children, especially those who are 3-years old. The enrollment for children ages 3-5 is steadily increasing in Georgia. Many of our LEAs are providing high quality services for young children with disabilities; the services are for many children are often provided in a small group special education classroom settings as there are a limited number of settings in which to include young children. The data reveal that the vast majority of young children represented in the count for indicator 6b are not in residential or separate school settings but in a special education classroom receiving appropriate services.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	78.35%	78.40%
		Data					68.70%	70.30%	78.80%	76.30%	76.20%	78.36%	80.63%
A2	2008	Target ≥						59.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	61.40%	61.50%
		Data					57.10%	57.10%	60.80%	60.30%	61.30%	61.42%	61.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥						66.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	81.00%	81.10%
		Data					63.90%	74.20%	81.80%	80.20%	81.40%	81.03%	84.25%
B2	2008	Target ≥						27.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	36.70%	36.90%
		Data					24.90%	27.70%	33.00%	35.30%	36.70%	36.70%	42.43%
C1	2008	Target ≥						73.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	77.35%	77.50%
		Data					71.20%	69.20%	79.20%	76.00%	76.30%	77.38%	81.27%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	71.45%	71.50%
		Data					65.70%	66.60%	69.70%	70.80%	71.00%	71.49%	70.91%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	78.50%	78.50%
	Data	80.32%	78.46%
A2	Target ≥	61.60%	61.70%
	Data	65.58%	64.30%
B1	Target ≥	81.20%	81.30%
	Data	83.05%	82.49%
B2	Target ≥	37.00%	37.10%
	Data	48.53%	48.62%
C1	Target ≥	77.70%	77.90%
	Data	80.43%	78.55%
C2	Target ≥	71.70%	71.90%
	Data	74.85%	81.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	78.60%	78.60%
Target A2 ≥	61.80%	62.00%
Target B1 ≥	81.40%	81.50%
Target B2 ≥	37.20%	37.30%
Target C1 ≥	78.00%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	72.00%	72.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	7,123
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	97	1.36%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	795	11.16%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,814	25.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,698	23.84%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,719	38.17%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3512.00	4404.00	78.46%	78.60%	79.75%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	4417.00	7123.00	64.30%	61.80%	62.01%

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	96	1.35%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	966	13.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,682	37.65%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,354	33.05%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,025	14.39%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	5036.00	6098.00	82.49%	81.40%	82.58%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3379.00	7123.00	48.62%	37.20%	47.44%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	89	1.25%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	668	9.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,306	18.33%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,674	23.50%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,386	47.54%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2980.00	3737.00	78.55%	78.00%	79.74%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	5060.00	7123.00	81.58%	72.00%	71.04%

**Reasons for C2 Slippage**

Georgia reported a 10.5% decrease in the percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by the time they turned 6 or exited preschool. For each LEA, the outcome data from 2017 was compared to the outcome data from 2018. Eighty-six (86) LEAs reported a percentage decrease from 2017 to 2018. Fifty-two (52) LEAs reported a decrease of greater than 10%. Each year this measure reports an entirely different group of children. An attempt to examine the disability area of the children from year to year proved futile as the vast majority of young children in Georgia are categorized as Significantly Developmentally Delayed; this is very appropriate as young children grow and develop behaviorally, socially and cognitively at different rates. Of note however is that Georgia reported an additional 275 young children with Autism in 2018, an increase from 8% of young children with disabilities to 9.4% of children with disabilities were identified as children with Autism. Students with Autism often struggle with appropriate behaviors at a young age. Examining the data for 4 and 5-year-olds only (those that may have been reported as exiting preschool), Georgia reported an additional 161 students with Autism ages 4 or 5 in 2018.

When examining reasons for the decrease in this outcome area, the fact that appropriateness of behavior is a very subjective area must be considered. Training staff working with young children, especially the preschool teachers who assess young children when they exit, regarding observation and proper assessment protocol will be conducted.

Georgia is committed to improving outcomes for all children. The GADOE has partnered with the Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning (DECAL), and the Georgia Department of Public Health/Babies Can't Wait (Part C) to develop the Georgia Early Learning and Development Standards (GELDS). Extensive training to understand and implement the GELDS is in process in FY2019 for preschool teachers and staff.

**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

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** Yes

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

Data for Indicator 7 are collected at the student level in each LEA that provides special education services to young children. No statewide assessment exists for young children (ages 3 and 4); therefore, districts collect these data using tools such as observation tools, checklists, and standardized assessments. LEAs were asked to provide the names of the assessments used and reported the following: DP-3, TELD 3, CAAP, DAY C 2, PLS 5, GFTA 2, Teacher checklist, Tier information, Fluharty, VABS 2, Speech samples, BDI 2, Teacher reports, childhood history, Vineland II, Behavior Checklist, PALS, PPVT, DAYC:2, DASH, Brigance Early Childhood Screening, Hawaii Early Learning Profile, Expressive and Receptive OWPVT, and Goldman Fristoe. The state created a task force to study how these data are collected to provide guidance to the LEAs. GADOE Special Education leadership has received input from the State Advisory Panel and other stakeholders to guide this work.

Special education directors are provided a spreadsheet on which to enter their student level data. Student name, date of birth, program entry date, age of entry, entrance rating, duration of service and exit rating is entered for each preschool student. The spreadsheet then calculates the ratings for each of the 3 outcomes. Data is reported for children who have been in the preschool program for at least 6 months and exit the program to Kindergarten or turn six. Special education directors report these data in the Preschool Outcomes Application in the GADOE portal. The summary statements are automatically calculated for each outcome.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	44.00%	44.50%
Data		32.00%	30.00%	27.00%	30.00%	36.00%	39.00%	39.00%	40.00%	44.00%	46.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	45.00%	69.00%
Data	49.00%	69.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	71.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR.

During the 2016-2017, a new Parent Survey was used. The SAP was involved in developing the survey. The indicator 8 data were shared with the SAP and discussions were held regarding participation and results. The SAP participated in discussions which led to targets for the new survey.

Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
16,108	22,687	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

0.00

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

**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.**

During the 2017-2018 Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirement. All families of children with disabilities had the opportunity to participate in the survey. Paper copies were also available upon request. Georgia began using the online survey during the 2016-2017 school year. In prior years Georgia used a sampling methodology which placed some of our schools on a 5-year rotation for participation, not affording all parents the opportunity to participate.

Georgia did not report the number of surveys distributed because no distribution takes place. The survey is available to all parents of children with disabilities in Georgia.

The Parent Survey allows all parents of children with disabilities ages 3-21 to participate in the survey. The survey is publicized by each LEA and the GADOE so that all parents of children with disabilities including parents of children in preschool may respond to the survey. The data from the parents of preschool children is included with the data reported for all parent responses. Of the respondents who reported the grade level of their child, 1,332 were preschool. 22,463 of the 22,687 respondents reported a grade level; therefore 5.8% of respondents were parents of children with disabilities in preschool programs.

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** No

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The GADOE conducts webinars, provides training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and provides information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization.

Training will focus on the importance of high participation and use of the parent survey. Strategies will be shared to encourage high participation and participation representative of the student enrollment in the LEA. Strategies include: providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school, analyzing real time data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation, sharing participation data with principals to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful LEAs with neighboring LEAs that struggle with low participation rates.

**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.**

Georgia's percentage of parental involvement in FFY17 rose to 71% from 69% in the FFY16. The number of valid responses increased from 20,039 in FFY2016 to 22,687 in FFY2017. The methodology used by Georgia for the measuring Indicator 8 is an online survey available to all parents of SWD in Georgia, therefore a number of surveys distributed cannot be reported.

These data were analyzed to examine the demographics of the parents responding. The survey responses were not representative of the SWD enrolled in Georgia for area of disability or race/ethnicity. Attached are charts, FFY17 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity and FFY17 Student Enrollment by Disability Category. These charts display the comparison between the race/ethnicity of children enrolled in Georgia in FFY17 and the race/ethnicity of the children whose parents responded to the survey, and the disability area of children enrolled in Georgia in FFY17 and the disability category of the children whose parents responded to the survey.

The disability area data show that the percentage of responses were higher from parents of children with Autism; responses were commensurate or lower for all other areas of disability. The attached chart, FFY17 Student Enrollment by Disability Area, displays this comparison. 5.8% (1,325) of respondents did not designate the disability category of their child and therefore are not included in the chart.

These data were also examined to compare the state's enrollment by race/ethnicity and the parents' responses by race/ethnicity. The attached chart, FFY17 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, displays this comparison. Note that not all parents reported their race/ethnicity category when responding to the survey.

These data reveal that a higher percentage of parents of White SWD responded to the survey compared to percentage of White SWD enrolled. A lower percentage of parents of Black and Hispanic SWD responded to the survey as compared to Black and Hispanic SWD enrolled. A Spanish version of the survey was available both online and paper format. Increased efforts must be made to publicize the availability of the survey to all families.

LEA level data have been shared with each Special Education Director. SEA staff and Parent Mentors have worked and will continue to work with Special Education Directors to provide strategies for increasing participation in the survey in FFY18 across all demographic groups. The data is being further analyzed, by region and LEA to determine why a lower percentage of parents of Black students participated in the survey. SEA staff will analyze the real time data of surveys completed in the current year and contact Special Education Directors to examine their data which is available in the Special Education Dashboard by school. The demographic data is not displayed to Special Education directors to avoid identifying the parents who respond. However, the directors may view the number of responses by school and are knowledgeable about the demographic makeup of each school. The SEA staff will encourage directors to reach out to district and school leaders to increase awareness and importance of the survey, publicize the survey at school events, and provide technology for survey completion at events and meetings.

The GADOE conducts webinars, provides training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), the annual Parent Mentor Partnership Conference, and provides information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization.

## Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

## OSEP Response

## Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.50%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 4

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-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1	1	207	0%	0%	0.48%

**Reasons for Slippage**

In FFY2017, Georgia reported that one (1) LEA had disproportionate representation due to noncompliant policies, practices and procedures. The noncompliant LEA was the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). DJJ did not identify any of the children as students with disabilities (SWD). The SWD were placed in DJJ as a result of unlawful actions and judges' decisions. The educational staff at DJJ has no control over the disability status of the incarcerated students enrolling in the LEA at the facility. However, after a review of their policies, practices and procedures regarding evaluation and identification of children, the GADOE found that the DJJ lacked compliant procedures. The GADOE will continue to provide technical assistance to staff at the DJJ to ensure compliant procedures in the future.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

Georgia identifies LEAs as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any LEA that has a Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years for a specific disability category in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. Districts whose data reveals that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 1 district was identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. This district developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

**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).**

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Alternate Risk Ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for two consecutive years {FFY 2016,  $\geq 3.0$  and FFY 2017,  $\geq 3.0$ } and (2) SWD Subgroup  $\geq 15$ .

Georgia has a minimum cell size of 15 for Students with Disabilities. Four (4) LEAs did not meet this cell size.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Georgia identifies LEAs as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any LEA that has a Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years for a specific disability category in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. Districts whose data reveals that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 1 district was identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. This district developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the [district/# districts] identified in FFY 2017 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification [is/are] in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

### Required Actions



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.26%	2.71%	1.08%	1.07%	3.23%	2.63%	3.55%	4.00%	6.00%	3.98%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	11.27%	8.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 4

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-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
35	6	207	8.29%	0%	2.90%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

Georgia identifies LEAs as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any LEA that has a Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years for a specific disability category in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes.

Districts whose data reveals that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 6 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These districts developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

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).

Georgia has a minimum n size of 15. Four (4) LEAs did not meet the minimum cell size for at least one racial/ethnic subgroup; therefore, 209 districts were considered. Georgia has developed a Special Education Dashboard, which enables districts to view their data and understand how their alternate risk ratio is calculated.

Georgia defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Alternate Risk Ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for two consecutive years {FFY 2016  $\geq 3.0$  and FFY 2017  $\geq 3.0$ } and (2) SWD Subgroup  $\geq 15$  (minimum cell size).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

Georgia uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes.

Districts identified as having disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 6 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These districts developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17	17	0	0

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State convened a team of colleagues to review the sampling of eligibility reports for compliant practices based on the evaluation and eligibility rules. It was expected that the new sampling would demonstrate compliant practices. After reviewing the sampling, the State provided additional feedback on the districts' progress and held teleconferences with the districts to share the findings. If additional technical assistance was needed, the GADOE made onsite visits to the districts and held teleconferences and webinars to provide additional support for correction of noncompliance. The State continued to review subsequent data until the LEAs demonstrated compliance and all individual incidences of noncompliance were corrected.

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

In FFY 2016, 17 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All 17 districts received written notification of noncompliance with specific provisions of the Part B regulations by June 30, 2017. All 17 districts corrected the noncompliance within one year of written notification. The districts were asked to submit a sampling of eligibility reports developed since the noncompliance determination for review by the State. The State verified correction of noncompliance for all districts. The State: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the [district/# districts] identified in FFY 2017 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification [is/are] in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.50%	88.28%	89.13%	94.00%	96.43%	97.39%	97.80%	97.70%	98.28%	98.42%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.80%	98.56%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
32,720	32,035	98.56%	100%	97.91%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	685
---	-----

**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.**

Indicator 11: Georgia had 685 students whose evaluation was not completed within the required 60 days.

The following data describes the number of days and reasons late.

The number of students in each range of days beyond the 60-day timeline are:

Evaluation completed 1 -10 days after 60 days (41.8%)	286
Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days (26.3%)	180
Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days (13.3%)	91
Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days (18.7%)	128
<b>Total</b>	<b>685</b>

685 evaluation were not completed in a timely manner in FFY17. The number of students for each reason for delay is shown below:

Student delay (excessive absences, withdrawal, re-enrollment)	14
Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner)	159
Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists)	363
District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures)	98
Other reasons: school closure due to weather	51

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.**

LEAs maintain a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A spreadsheet is provided for LEA use which tracks the number of referrals completed on time, eligibility determination of the referrals (eligible or not eligible), if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submit these data by July 31<sup>st</sup> each year for the previous fiscal year. The data are submitted in the Timelines Application in the Special Education Dashboard.

The GADOE reviewed the Child Find data of each school district to ensure timely initial evaluations. Each district submitted a timeline report by July 31. Georgia has a 60 days requirement for receipt of consent to eligibility determination. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area.

Those LEAs not at 100% must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation.

The GA DOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors are to upload child specific data for the students who they reported with completed evaluations/eligibility determinations the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 892 evaluations/eligibility determinations completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion date, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 892 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GA DOE staff may then check these data against what the LEA reported in the Student Record data collection.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
480	480	0	0

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Georgia requires that each LEA submit Child Find timeline data by July 31st each year. LEAs reporting data that reveal that some evaluations/eligibilities were not completed within 60 days are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation. Technical assistance is provided by GADOE staff to LEAs to ensure compliance.

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

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Dashboard.

Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.50%	84.40%	96.30%	98.00%	98.31%	98.50%	99.20%	98.80%	98.80%	99.21%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.75%	99.52%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,332
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	761
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,386
d. Number of children 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.	122
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	28
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.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	3,386	3,421	99.52%	100%	98.98%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	35
--	----

**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.**

In FFY2017 Georgia reported 35 students (1.02%) whose IEPs were not in place by the 3rd birthday. The following data describes the number of days late and the reasons late.

The number of students in each range of days beyond the child's 3rd birthday:

1 - 10 days: 17 students (48.6%)

11 - 30 days: 9 students (25.7%)

31 - 60 days: 6 students (17.0%)

> 60 days: 3 students (8.6%)

The number of students whose IEP was not in place by the child's 3rd birthday by reason:

Student delay: 1 student (2.9%)

Parent delay: 16 (45.7%)

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Teacher/evaluator delay: 3 students (8.6%)

System errors: 1 student (2.9%)

Other (school closure due to weather): 14 students (40.0%)

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

LEAs maintain a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. A spreadsheet is provided for LEA use which tracks the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submit these data by July 31<sup>st</sup> each year for the previous fiscal year. The data are submitted in the Timelines Application in the Special Education Dashboard. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance.

The State reviewed the Early Childhood Transition data of each school district to ensure that for each consent, the IEP was in place by the child's 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday for those young children who were eligible for services. Each district submitted a timeline report by July 31. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area.

Those LEAs not at 100% must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year Early Childhood Transition data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities and IEPs completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GADOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation.

The GADOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors are to upload child specific data for the students who they reported with completed evaluations/eligibility/IEPs the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 150 evaluations/eligibility/IEPs for young children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion date, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 150 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GADOE staff may then check these data against what the LEA reported in the Student Record data collection.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	null	0

### FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia requires that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by July 31st each year. LEAs reporting data that reveal that some young children referred to special education from Part C and found eligible, did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination and IEP were completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities and IEPs for young children referred from Part C completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November each year. GADOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely transition from Part C to Part B. Technical assistance is provided by GADOE staff to LEAs to ensure compliance.

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

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Dashboard.

Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late (IEP held beyond the 3rd birthday) and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

### Required Actions



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					85.80%	5.50%	31.50%	60.10%	94.50%	94.98%	97.16%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.40%	99.09%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
541	574	99.09%	100%	94.25%

**Reasons for Slippage**

In FFY2017 Georgia implemented a new process for collecting Indicator 13 data. The explanation of the new method is provided below. The total number of plans reviewed from each LEA was greatly reduced. In FFY16 the GADOE reviews 4055 plans and of those plans reviewed 4018 were compliant. In FFY17, 574 plans were reviewed and 541 were found compliant. When developing the new methodology, GADOE staff were aware that there was a greater risk for error, however the task of reviewing so many plans proved to be overwhelming for GADOE and LEA staff. The work to improve Indicator 13 compliance is extensive. GADOE staff held an in-person training for LEA directors in October of this year, has developed a series of seven (7) transition webinars, and has resources posted for LEAs and families on the Transition Planning webpage of the Special Education website.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.**

In FFY2017, Georgia revised the process for collecting data for Indicator 13. The expectation is that all students 14 and older have an appropriate and compliant transition plan, however Georgia uses a sample from each LEA to determine whether the LEA has compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. Based on the size of the LEA, two (2) to five (5) student names are randomly selected by the GADOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October each year. The selected students will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. LEAs will have the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GADOE review. GADOE staff will review all plans submitted and determine compliance. For LEAs that have transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities will be required.

Prong 1 requires the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 requires the submission of additional transition plans for review. LEAs with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. LEAs with continued non-compliance are required to continue to submit plans until the GADOE determines that the transition plans have the required components for secondary transition.

The GADOE calculates the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans submitted including those submitted in Prong 2.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

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?  Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
37	37	null	0

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Georgia uses a sample of transition plans from each LEA to determine whether the LEA has compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. Based on the size of the LEA, two (2) to five (5) student names are randomly selected by the GADOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October each year. The selected students will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. LEAs will have the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GADOE review. GADOE staff will review all plans submitted and determine compliance. For LEAs that have transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities will be required.

Prong 1 requires the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 requires the submission of additional transition plans for review. LEAs with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. LEAs with continued non-compliance are required to continue to submit plans until the GADOE determines that the transition plans have the required components for secondary transition.

Technical assistance is also provided to the LEAs by GADOE staff. In isolated instances, the GADOE staff made personal visits to an LEA to provide training. All LEAs have multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. A webinar series was developed for all LEAs to promote compliance for Transition Planning. The GADOE also offers training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and to teachers at the annual Institute Designed for Education ALL Students (IDEAS) conference.

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

Prong 1 requires the correction of individual non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. LEAs were required to submit non-compliant plans until compliance was verified by the GADOE.

Technical assistance is also provided to the LEAs by GADOE staff. In isolated instances, the GADOE staff made personal visits to an LEA to provide training. All LEAs have multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. A webinar series was developed for all LEAs to promote compliance for Transition Planning. The GADOE also offers training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and to teachers at the annual Institute Designed for Education ALL Students (IDEAS) conference.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	24.80%	24.80%
		Data						27.23%	26.90%	24.70%	24.80%	24.78%	24.39%
B	2009	Target ≥							53.00%	53.50%	53.50%	53.60%	53.60%
		Data						51.46%	52.80%	52.50%	51.00%	53.64%	53.73%
C	2009	Target ≥							79.00%	80.00%	80.00%	79.90%	79.90%
		Data						77.08%	76.80%	76.30%	77.60%	79.95%	81.04%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	25.50%	26.25%
	Data	26.00%	25.80%
B	Target ≥	53.70%	53.70%
	Data	56.07%	58.75%
C	Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%
	Data	78.46%	82.88%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	27.00%	27.40%
Target B ≥	53.90%	54.00%
Target C ≥	80.10%	80.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2017 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	10481.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2720.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3543.00
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)	937.00
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).	1491.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

		who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2720.00	10481.00	25.80%	27.00%	25.95%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6263.00	10481.00	58.75%	53.90%	59.76%
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)	8691.00	10481.00	82.88%	80.10%	82.92%

**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.

Option 2: 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.

**Was sampling used?** No

**Was a survey used?** No

**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.**

Georgia's response data are representative of the race/ethnicity of the students who exited in FFY16 (FY17) and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. 1 year later in FFY17 (FY18). See the attached chart. Georgia's response data is also representative of the disability area of the students who exited in FFY16(FY17) and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. See the attached chart.

**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

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			88.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	62.70%	62.70%
Data		88.00%	47.00%	50.00%	41.20%	52.50%	25.00%	49.00%	48.00%	62.71%	62.90%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	62.80%	62.90%
Data	64.55%	57.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	63.00%	63.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	33	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	72	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
33	72	57.83%	63.00%	45.83%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Georgia reported data for Indicator 15 that resulted in slippage in the percentage of resolution sessions that were resolved through settlement agreements. Georgia reported a decrease in the number of resolution meetings held in the 2017-2018 school year. In school year 2016-2017 Georgia reported 83 resolution meetings. In school year 2017-2018, 72 resolution meetings were held, 11 fewer. Although a fewer number of resolution meetings took place, a fewer number were successfully resolved resulting in a smaller percentage. The confidential nature of the resolution process makes it difficult to accurately analyze why some resolution meetings were successful and others were not. The GADOE is not privy to the confidential discussions between districts and families. The data do, however, indicate that fewer resolution meetings are held.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			66.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		62.90%	56.25%	58.90%	50.90%	68.85%	63.20%	50.00%	48.00%	63.27%	60.71%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	60.00%	60.00%
Data	48.53%	54.44%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017			2018		
Target	50.00%	-	70.00%	50.00%	-	70.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2018, November 2018 and January 2019 the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	11	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	54	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	103	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
11	54	103	54.44%	50.00% - 70.00%	63.11%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		41.00%			
Data	39.46%				

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target ≥	

Key:

**Description of Measure**

See the attachment for Georgia's SSIP.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**Overview**

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Description

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Theory of Action**

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

**Infrastructure Development**

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

**Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices**

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

**Evaluation**

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

**Technical Assistance and Support**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

**Selected:** 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: Zelphine Smith-Dixon

Title: State Director

Email: zsmith@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone: 404-987-1568