

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Georgia



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

In FFY 2022, Georgia continued to show growth in the enrollment of students with disabilities following the pandemic. There was an increase of 6,323 students with disabilities from the prior school year. Participation in assessments for all students, including students with disabilities, continued with the robust trend from the prior year and was at pre-pandemic levels. Georgia met all participation goals for students with disabilities on Indicator 3A of the SPP/APR as a result. All participation levels for students with disabilities were above the target of 95% for 2022-2023. Assessment results from the 2022-2023 school year did not show a recovery to pre-pandemic levels. In recognition of the extensive needs of students with disabilities, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) continued several initiatives targeting students with disabilities designed to improve student outcomes and aid in teacher retention including Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)), the School Completion Toolkit (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>) and the Georgia Teacher/Provider Retention Program (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>). The nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program with a grant of \$500,000 provided support for LEAs in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families. Georgia's DSESS also supported school level administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities and continued the School Based Administrators Academy (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>). Georgia's Annual Performance Report for 2022-2023 continued to demonstrate Georgia's resilience and commitment to providing services for students with disabilities and building inclusive partnerships with families and communities.

Georgia met targets for the following SPP/APR Indicators: 3A (Assessment Participation for Reading and Math, Groups A, B, and C, for Grades 4, 8, and High School), 3C (Reading Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, Group B, Grade 8), 3C (Math Proficiency, Group C, High School), 4A (Significant Discrepancy), 4B (Significant Discrepancy), 5C (Educational Environment, Separate Settings), 6C (Early Childhood Environment - Services in the Home), 7A (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive Social-Emotional Outcomes), 7B (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills), 7C (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs), 9 (Disproportionate Representation), 14B (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed), 14C (Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education, or Some Other Type of Postsecondary Training, Competitively Employed, or Employed in Some Other Employment) and Indicator 17 (State Systemic Improvement Plan).

Georgia did not meet targets but had no slippage for the following Indicators: 3B (Reading Proficiency, Group B, Grade 8), 3B (Math Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, and Group B, Grade 8), 3C (Reading Proficiency, Group C, High School), 3C (Math Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, Group B, Grade 8), 3D (Reading Proficiency Gaps in Groups A, B, and C, for Grades 4, 8, and High School), 3D (Math Proficiency Gaps in Group B, Grade 8), 5A (Educational Environment, Inside the Regular Classroom 80% or More), 5B (Educational Environment, Inside the Regular Classroom <40%), 6A (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of Services in the Regular Childhood Program), 7A (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive Social-Emotional Outcomes), 7C (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their Needs), 8 (Parent Satisfaction Survey), 11 (Child Find), 12 (Early Childhood Transition), 14 A (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education),

Georgia had slippage in SPP/APR Indicators: Indicator 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 3B (Reading Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, and Group C, High School), 3B (Math Proficiency, Group C, High School), 3D (Math Proficiency Gaps, Group A, Grade 4, and Group C, High School), 6B (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of Services in Separate Classroom, Separate School, or Residential Facility), 7A (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive Social-Emotional Outcomes), 7B (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills), 7C (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs), and 10 (Disproportionate Representation by Specific Eligibility Category), 13 (Secondary Transition), 15 (Resolution Sessions), and 16 (Mediations).

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has continued to have a supportive stance in addressing the needs of students, teachers, leaders, and families. The DSESS provided ongoing technical assistance and guidance for special education leaders and partnered with other divisions to address the needs of all leaders. Georgia has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>).

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The FFY 2022 data set was the most comprehensive since the onset of COVID and was far more robust than the prior three years' of COVID impacted data. Unfortunately, Georgia's data depicted the impact of COVID in several areas, but most notably in the area of Indicator 3 Assessment. Georgia met 9 of the 24 Indicator 3 targets and had slippage in 5 targets. Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities. The results of these efforts will require time to show an impact in assessment results.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

227

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

DSESS 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 DSESS provided appropriate accountability to ensure that 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. The DSESS monitored each LEA every year through a tiered monitoring system to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the DSESS conducted a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. The State provided increased or more intensive supports based on the analysis of data. An additional critical component of Georgia's continuous improvement monitoring is Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM), which is conducted using a four-year cycle. The CFM process is intensive and examines all components of a system's implementation of IDEA. The State monitors at least 60 LEAs each year in the process allowing all LEAs to be reviewed within the four-year cycle.

Tier 1 monitoring procedures were implemented for all LEAs to enforce compliance and improve results. Tier 1 activities included items such as a review of LEA Determination Data, Continuation of Services Data, Fiscal Risk Assessment, and Child Find Initial Evaluation Timelines.

Tier 2 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs based upon areas of noncompliance at Tier 1, such as exceeding the 60-day timeframe for Child Find Initial Evaluations. In addition to noncompliance, some LEAs may be targeted to receive supports based on local performance on indicators such as graduation, dropout, and young children's outcomes.

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 (i.e., Significant Disproportionality) or the CFM cycle.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any LEAs that demonstrated difficulty in the timely correction of noncompliance. Timely correction of noncompliance is within one year.

Using all four tiers of monitoring, the DSESS ensured timely identification and correction of noncompliance and fostered a "continuous improvement monitoring process."

Example of Monitoring Process -

In Tier 1 for Child Find, the GaDOE provided all LEAs with monitoring and analysis tools, such as spreadsheets with calculations of the 60-day timeline. LEAs who used Georgia Online IEP (GO-IEP, the voluntary State IEP program), had timelines automatically calculated in alignment with their local calendars. Tier 2 supports were provided for LEAs that did not meet the 100% target for completion of initial evaluations in the 60-day timeline. Those LEAs were required to submit an update regarding their review of policies, procedures, and practices to support correction of the non-compliance, a list of students reported late along with the rationale for the delay, and any other relevant supporting information.

Examples of Monitoring Activities for all SPP/APR indicators -

Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) - The DSESS conducted reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for LEAs. The DSESS reviewed records from all LEAs in the CFM process which included IEPs, eligibility reports, and transition plans. LEAs are monitored in the CFM process over a four-year cycle. Some LEAs may be monitored more frequently if deemed High Risk. Risk assessment is completed to determine if an LEA falls into the high-risk category. High-risk LEAs are defined as:

- showing evidence of serious or chronic compliance problems
- having previous financial monitoring/audit findings
- having a high number of complaints from parents and other stakeholders about program implementation.

Fiscal Monitoring - Monitoring of federal programs is conducted to ensure that all children have a fair and equal educational opportunity. CFM emphasizes accountability for using federal resources wisely and supports LEAs in effective program implementation using federal allocations. The IDEA fiscal statutes are the primary framework for fiscal monitoring. Uniform Grant's Guidance, along with other pertinent federal regulations, guides the fiscal monitoring process of CFM.

Data Verifications and Audits - DSESS 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. This level of verification impacted a targeted group of LEAs.

Dispute Resolution - The DSESS 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 correction of noncompliance for LEAs identified through a complaint investigation or a due process hearing.

Disproportionality Compliance Review - The DSESS required all LEAs identified as having some type of disproportionality determination to complete the Compliance Review. The DSESS reviewed these data and other pertinent documentation to determine compliance.

Timeline Reviews - Timeline summary reports are submitted as a part of the required publicly reported data to the DSESS. 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:

[https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia's-Continuous-Improvement-Monitoring-Process-\(GCIMP\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia's-Continuous-Improvement-Monitoring-Process-(GCIMP).aspx)

Technical Assistance System:

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

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) includes 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, 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 result 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 national partners to provide additional

technical assistance to LEAs.

TTA opportunities can be both voluntary and prescribed. For example, LEAs that are determined Significantly Disproportionate must participate in Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services, but systems may voluntarily participate in Disproportionality TTA and reserve up to 15% of IDEA funds to address overrepresentation difficulties that do not meet the threshold for Disproportionality determination.

During FFY22, monthly Technical Assistance (TA) was provided to all LEAs through Monthly Special Education Directors Webinars which can be accessed at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Directors%27-Webinars.aspx>). The webinars provided timely information regarding topics such as Assistive Technology, English Learners and Students with Disabilities, IEP Development, and Extended School Year Services.

Georgia also provided LEAs an IDEA Implementation Manual which is periodically updated at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Implementation-Manual.aspx>). The manual serves as a practical guide for implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its regulations. The purpose of this manual is to provide practical ideas and best practice information on the implementation of the Georgia Special Education State Rules for administrators, principals, regular education teachers, special education teachers, related services providers, parents, and students with disabilities. When the manual was initiated, technical assistance was conducted in several sessions and was made available to all of Georgia's LEA-level personnel. Georgia has also invested a great deal of effort and resources into a tiered system of supports which can be accessed at Georgia's Tiered System of Supports for Students (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/TieredSystemofSupports.aspx>) to provide support for all LEAs and students.

The Collaborative Communities approach is another technical assistance model in which stakeholders are engaged in solving critical problems and supporting each other in their efforts. The Collaborative Communities are regularly scheduled (typically monthly) regional technical assistance meetings that all Georgia's LEAs may attend. 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. District liaisons (DLs) from the DSESS participate in these monthly sessions. The DLs provide updates on GaDOE initiatives and answer questions for stakeholders.

Georgia has continued to strengthen its relationship with National Technical Assistance Centers including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), National Center for Educational Outcome (NCEO), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). 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: The Collaborative (NTACT-C) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services. The Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) provides technical assistance for fiscal reporting.

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 children with disabilities.

Professional Development (PD) is a constantly improving process in Georgia. PD ranges from a basic level of providing general information to a more targeted and intensive level of learning, which is job-embedded and data-driven with a focus on student achievement and school improvement. Research suggests that to build capacity, a framework that includes understanding the stages of the change process must be used. The stages of change are Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and Sustainability and Innovation. These stages of change require that an LEA commits to a multi-year process of improvement. Georgia is committed to providing all LEAs with ongoing support for instruction, data, and learning resources.

Georgia's State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) houses longitudinal information on student attendance, assessment information, and grades. SLDS also contains the Georgia Learns PD Hub, which has greatly enhanced virtual learning opportunities for LEA district and school-level personnel. There are multiple modules on the platform that provide information about effectively writing IEPs and using the GO-IEP program. There are also numerous instructional provision presentations available on the platform. The courses on the Georgia Learns – PD Hub can be monitored by course instructors to evaluate participants' completion and accuracy in mastery of course objectives.

The GaDOE Community (<https://www.gadoe.org/Technology-Services/KRM/Pages/GaDOE-Community.aspx>), a new digital space, provides opportunities for educators to collaborate and participate in continuous learning. Educators can build professional networks, join specific groups (i.e., Special Education Data Support, GO-IEP Users), share resources, complete microlearning courses, and share upcoming professional learning events.

The Division of Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) collaborated 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 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, 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 LEA, administrative, school, or specialist 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:

- 1) Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: <https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>
- 2) State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Professional Development Videos: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Personnel-Development-Grant.aspx>
- 3) GaDOE Special Education Professional Learning Resources: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-.aspx>
 - Specially Designed Instruction: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)
 - Georgia Teacher/Provider Retention Program: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>
 - High-Leverage Practices: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/HighLeveragePracticesSpEd.aspx>

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

221

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Current Stakeholder Advisement - Beginning with a SAP work session on September 13, 2023, SPP/APR data was reviewed through a cohesive framework for SPP/APR Indicators designed to foster greater stakeholder engagement, including parent engagement. The framework was established at the beginning of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and initially shared with the SAP on May 6, 2021. The framework has provided the SAP with consistency in the areas of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. In the framework, the Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following clusters to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14, and 17), Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10), Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12), Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16), and Assessment (Indicator 3). The SAP had 37 parent members, and all were engaged in reviewing the progress data for the SPP/APR Indicators targets in small groups of four to five participants. A Part B Data Manager provided a review of SPP/APR Indicator data with frequent opportunities for participant discussion through a series of guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. Examples of guided questions were: "Which Indicators concern you the most in this cluster [High School and Life Indicators]? What strategies would you suggest for improving disproportionality?" Following the active SAP work session, the small group responses were collected by the Part B Data Manager for compilation.

On November 8, 2023, both Part B Data Managers met with the SAP and shared the compiled results of the September 13, 2023, meeting. The results were also posted on the SPP/APR website in the presentation titled, State Performance Plan- Check Up Part II (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)). For the High School and Life Outcomes cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14, and 17), SAP members commented, "Dropping out is an especially serious issue when children dropout and are involved in the justice system. Determine the specific reasons that students are dropping out and specifically target those reasons." In response to these comments, SAP members were provided with a link to the School Completion Toolkit, a strong resource for preventing dropouts (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>). SAP members were also concerned with transition for students with disabilities. SAP members commented, "Secondary transition is of the most concern. If this [the process] doesn't go well, then graduation rate, dropout, and postschool outcomes can all be impacted." SAP members were provided with a link to the DSESS webpage for transition which includes the topical areas of transition best practices, self-determination initiatives, and transition compliance.

The SAP was provided with current Indicator 3 assessment data on January 17, 2024. SAP members reflected on the high level of rigor and expectation in the indicator 3 targets. Georgia met 9 of the 24 Indicator 3 targets and had slippage in 5 targets. Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities.

On September 14, 2023, a Part B Data Manager and a special education director from an LEA presented and received feedback on Indicators 3 and 8 at the annual Parent Mentor Kick-off Conference for Georgia. Participants included a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. Specific resources for reviewing assessment results and strategies for increasing Parent Survey participation were provided.

Historical Context for the Development of the SPP/APR with Stakeholder Feedback - The active involvement of the parent members through the SAP has been a strong area of focus since the inception of SPP/APR 2020-2025 package. The SAP was provided with an overview of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021. Parents and other SAP members continued advisement work on the SPP/APR 2020-2025 with an opportunity to participate in a work group session on September 2, 2021. On September 2, 2021, each SAP member, including parent members, participated in one of the cluster groups. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized presentation format.

For the September 2, 2021 meeting, each DSESS facilitator was provided with a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each SAP group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. The goals for September 2, 2021 cluster work group session were: 1) to review a process for SPP/APR development using cluster groups, 2) evaluate trend data for the specific cluster work group, 3) examine processes for setting targets (i.e., percentage increase per year, averaging, statistical methods, etc.), 4) examine stakeholder requirements (i.e., degree of parent involvement required, encouraging diverse and broad input), and 5) review the plan and mechanism for feedback collection and finalizing targets. For goal 1, facilitators shared a graphic with all SPP/APR Indicators grouped into one of the five clusters (i.e., Group A. High School and Life Outcomes - Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14) to provide a cohesive framework to view the development of the SPP/APR for 2020-2025. The second goal was met by sharing the specific current and longitudinal data for a minimum of 3 years for each Indicator. Longitudinal data for Indicators with new calculations or groups was converted from prior representations using the application of the new calculation and/or groupings. For goal 3, participants were shown a variety of methods for calculating targets (i.e., start with the end goal) and provided with examples. The purpose was to increase knowledge and ownership of the process of target setting with stakeholders. The fourth goal was facilitated by providing specific descriptions of stakeholder feedback requirements from the SPP/APR 2020-2025 Measurement Table. Finally, for goal 5, participants reviewed Georgia's methods and timeline for soliciting input on targets to a wide ranging and diverse group of participants including virtual presentations and feedback sessions, an online survey, and posting of proposed targets for public feedback. On October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022, SAP members were provided with additional follow-up opportunities to provide specific feedback on data, targets, improvement strategies and progress. SAP members also had the opportunity to participate in the online SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

There were six meeting opportunities to provide feedback on the SPP/APR and initiatives associated with improving outcomes for students. Three of the six meetings were conducted with the SAP (September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024). In addition to the discussion of longitudinal and current student data, SAP meetings provided information about specially designed instruction, Georgia's dyslexia initiative, addressing disproportionality, and SSIP initiatives to combat dropping out of school. All presentations provided SAP members with resources for additional information on the implementation of these instructional initiatives as well as the progress of their implementation. Presentations to SAP also provided details of the monitoring of initiatives (i.e., Specially Designed Instruction, Teacher Retention Grant, School Completion Toolkit) designed to improve student outcomes. All presentations regarding the SPP/APR clearly defined its Indicators, timeframe, and measurement to enhance stakeholder capacity to provide advisement. To assure that new SAP members had a longitudinal perspective on target setting for the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package a document, Target Setting for the SPP/APR, was also provided at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The Part B Data Managers conducted three meetings with groups other than the SAP to obtain SPP/APR feedback and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and an LEA level special education director presented current Indicator 3 and 8 data to a broad range of stakeholders including parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders at the annual Parent Mentor Partnership Kickoff. In addition to sharing current data, the presenters provided strategies and resources for improving outcomes on these Indicators. Building capacity in LEA level participants, particularly parents, on Indicator 3 will enhance the critical and effective use of assessment results to improve student achievement.

On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. Empowering beginning special education directors at the LEA level with SPP/APR data, targets, and progress enables them to review their LEA's Annual Performance Report more critically and enhance outcomes for students with disabilities. A critical portion of the session was upon explaining assessment results and accessing resources for assessment aligned with instruction. An emphasis was also placed upon reviewing their Indicator 8 data which is facilitated with a Parent Survey. Participants were encouraged to utilize the Parent Survey Application within the SE Applications Dashboard to increase participation in the Parent Survey during the availability window from January through May in which the online Parent Survey is conducted. Paper copies of the survey are also made available. The Parent Survey Application enables LEA special education directors to review the aggregated (not personally identifiable) results of the Parent Survey in real time as participants complete the Survey. LEA special education directors can target specific schools with low participation rates and focus upon increasing the response rate. As participation in the Parent Survey increases, parents can indicate their perspective on communication with LEA level personnel and the instructional activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities. Participants were provided with numerous resources for reviewing assessment results and strategies for sharing the information with LEAs. LEAs with enhanced capacity in sharing assessment results are able to communicate these results with parents more effectively. Parents are then able to more effectively participate in the evaluation of the implementation of activities designed to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

SPP/APR information, including current targets and presentations, was publicly posted at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)). Presentations on the website provided a description of the SPP/APR, Indicator data, APR progress, and initiatives used to improve outcomes. A document titled, SPP/APR 2020-2025 Target Setting Document, was posted to enable a review of longitudinal data related to target setting. There were no new proposed targets for the FFY2022 SPR/APR.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The document, Targets for SPP/APR 2020-2025 (updated November 2023), was posted on the SPP/APR website (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)). An additional document on the page titled, SPP/APR 2020-2025 Target Setting Document, contained comprehensive data analysis for public review and enabled an evaluation of longitudinal information for the 2020-2025 SPP/APR. Georgia updates information regarding the SPP/APR at this location. The current targets for the SPP/APR 2020-2025 were made available on January 9, 2024, for public comment.

There were no new proposed targets for the FFY2022 SPR/APR. The results of previous target setting for the SPP/APR 2020-2025 remain available on the SPP/APR website listed above. The SAP livebinder which is publicly available at (<https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.livebinders.com%2Fplay%2Fplay%3Fid%3D2395925&data=05%7C02%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C9bb55d9951be4067411108dc16d9c3a0%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C638410371750373803%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoiv2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haVWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdta=zglBOh62C%2BW%2FCGEdr1fBbwkKEZDMjcyjL1wrVWh6gU%3D&reserved=0>) provided meeting minutes and agendas for each month's SAP meeting. The minutes outlined the improvement strategies and instructional initiatives being implemented in Georgia for students with disabilities. The SPP/APR website has expanded the public posting of presentations and documents that provide improvement strategies for students with disabilities. The purpose of this expansion is to enable additional public comment. Public comment is available at each SAP meeting regarding the SPP/APR or any other matter regarding special education.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, 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: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Georgia's APR is available for the current and previous years.

LEA public Annual Performance Reports are available for public viewing using the following link: https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html. The user must enter the zip code for the LEA or type the name of the LEA they are interested in viewing.

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

Data for Indicators 1 and 2 are not publicly reported by LEAs as lagging data since Georgia has access to this information earlier than required for SPP/APR. For example, the FFY2019 data for Indicators 1 and 2 were reported on Georgia's Annual Performance Report for the 2019-2020 school year.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	69.55%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	57.60%	57.58%	62.27%	73.46%	69.55%
Data	56.27%	61.11%	62.94%	79.35%	69.55%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	71.55%	72.55%	73.55%	74.55%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services

- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	10,753
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,462
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,498

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
10,753	15,713	69.55%	71.55%	68.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Georgia requested and received a new baseline for this indicator in the FFY2021 SPP/APR due to a modification in the calculation of students included in the regular high school diploma rate to increase alignment with the EDFacts file specification FS009. The modification resulted in a decrease in the proportionate number of students included in the numerator for the calculation (only students attaining a regular diploma) which continued in FFY2022. The 1.12 percentage points decrease in the regular graduation rate is a result of several factors: 1) An increase of 12.38% in special education students graduating with a special education diploma in 2022 with a comparable increase of 11.04% in students graduating with a regular diploma, a discrepancy of 1.34 percentage points. 2) An increase of 12.46% in the number of students exiting special education (excluding students who exited due to death, moved known to be continuing, and transferred to general education). 3) An increase of 26.18% in 14–16-year-old dropouts, who previously would have been excluded from the denominator of the calculation if they had not entered 9th grade. This led to an increase in the denominator of the calculation. The decrease in the numerator paired with an increase in the denominator has resulted in a lower graduation rate. Numerous webinars and conferences for LEAs have highlighted the change in the graduation calculation.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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). Graduates must have met course and assessment criteria. Georgia offers one diploma for all students. This link provides information for the assessment and graduation requirements (<https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/State-Board-of-Education/SBOE%20Rules/160-4-2-.48.pdf>).

Georgia is reporting data from the 2021-2022 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP’s requirement to report data as submitted in SY 2021-2022 FS009 Students Exiting Special Education.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia has put several highly targeted initiatives in place to increase the number of students who are graduating. LEAs targeted in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are implementing Check and Connect and Early Warning System to address attendance and course completion for students with disabilities. These initiatives are beginning to be implemented in broader portions of the state. Georgia is also targeting academic deficits through comprehensive statewide professional learning in Specially Designed Instruction through partnerships with technical assistance centers and Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey. Georgia is also continuing the Teacher Retention Project to support and retain special education teachers. Georgia recognizes the need for teacher retention and efficacy in increasing student achievement and subsequently graduation.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	23.56%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	23.56%	22.56%
Data	5.74%	5.47%	5.13%	18.47%	21.14%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	21.56%	20.56%	19.56%	18.56%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center

- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	10,753
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,462
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3,498

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3,498	15,713	21.14%	21.56%	22.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In Georgia, students who exit an LEA with the reason of Unknown are counted as dropouts (see definition below). Highly transient overage middle school students were overrepresented within the Unknown category of exit and subsequently reported as dropouts. Middle school students have not historically been included in the dropout rate. As a result, LEA diligence in determining a reason for exit for middle school exiters has been less rigorous

than that applied to high school exiters. Their inclusion in the dropout rate has led to an increase in the dropout rate. There was an increase of 26.18% in 14–16-year-old dropouts from FFY 2021 (school year 2020-2021) to FFY2022 (school year 2021-2022). Middle school students in the 14-16-year-old age range would have previously been excluded from the calculation if they had not entered 9th grade. Numerous webinars and conferences for LEAs have highlighted the change in the dropout calculation which now includes middle schoolers. LEAs were advised to use multiple means for providing a more precise reason for exit, such as Transferred to Another LEA, instead of using the Unknown exit reason. When Unknown is used as the exit reason, the dropout rate increases.

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? (yes/no)

YES

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

Students with disabilities who are Incarcerated/Under Jurisdiction of Juvenile or Criminal Justice Authority are not dropouts in Georgia. The Department of Corrections and the Department of Juvenile Justice are both LEAs in Georgia and continue to provide services to students with disabilities who are incarcerated. Students with Disabilities who are incarcerated in local jails and short-term detention facilities are provided services by the LEAs in which the local jails or short-term detention facilities are located. All other withdrawal reasons for dropout indicated above are applicable to students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia has put several highly targeted initiatives in place to address the increase in students who are dropping out. LEAs targeted in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are implementing Check and Connect and Early Warning System to address attendance and course completion for students with disabilities. These initiatives are also beginning to be implemented in broader portions of the state. Georgia is also targeting academic deficits through comprehensive statewide professional learning in Specially Designed Instruction through partnerships with technical assistance centers and Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey. Georgia is also continuing the Teacher Retention Project to support and retain special education teachers. Georgia recognizes the need for teacher retention and efficacy in increasing student achievement and subsequently decreasing the drop out rate.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	77.84%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	63.30%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	62.74%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	77.70%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	61.48%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	60.71%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	19,162	19,482	15,952
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,236	1,776	1,356
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	13,662	15,139	12,653
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,742	1,925	1,525

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	19,162	19,482	20,317
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,243	1,837	1,942
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	13,635	15,026	16,125
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,737	1,913	1,514

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,640	19,162	97.26%	95.00%	97.28%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	18,840	19,482	96.69%	95.00%	96.70%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	15,534	15,952	96.93%	95.00%	97.38%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18,615	19,162	97.08%	95.00%	97.15%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	18,776	19,482	96.19%	95.00%	96.38%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	19,581	20,317	95.82%	95.00%	96.38%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia's data for assessment reflected a return to pre-pandemic levels for assessment participation.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response**3A - Required Actions**

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	12.77%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	9.17%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	5.50%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	18.93%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	7.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.69%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	16.77%	18.77%	20.77%	22.77%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	13.17%	15.17%	17.17%	19.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	9.50%	11.50%	13.50%	15.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	22.93%	24.93%	26.93%	28.93%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.91%	13.91%	15.91%	17.91%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	9.69%	11.69%	13.69%	15.69%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiansights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22

- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,898	16,915	14,009
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,276	572	281

c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	832	1,025	861
---	-----	-------	-----

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,878	16,863	18,067
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,733	608	470
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,822	1,054	1,168

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,108	16,898	13.52%	16.77%	12.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,597	16,915	8.50%	13.17%	9.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,142	14,009	8.27%	9.50%	8.15%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

A review of the assessment data indicated that students in large metro and North Georgia LEAs performed much lower on assessments than students in South Georgia. Assessment data indicated that in South Georgia there were only 15 schools in the highest level of required support for the current Georgia ESEA plan compared to 38 in the Metro area and 21 in North Georgia. The Metro area has the highest density of SWD leading to lowered results for the entire state and slippage.

The difference between the LEAs in South Georgia with North Georgia and the Metro region could be attributed to a more rapid return to in-person instruction following the pandemic. South Georgia returned to in-person instruction in the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. LEAs in North Georgia and the Metro region largely did not return to in-person instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. The return to in-person instruction benefited the South Georgia LEAs leading them to surpass results in other regions of the state. This has not been the historical trend with South Georgia LEAs which often performed more poorly on assessments. In-person instruction rather than virtual instruction appeared more beneficial based upon these results.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

A review of the assessment data indicated that students in large metro and North Georgia LEAs performed much lower on assessments than students in South Georgia. Assessment data indicated that in South Georgia there were only 15 schools in the highest level of required support for the current Georgia ESEA plan compared to 38 in the Metro area and 21 in North Georgia. The Metro area has the highest density of SWD leading to lowered results for the entire state and slippage.

The difference between the LEAs in South Georgia with North Georgia and the Metro region could be attributed to a more rapid return to in-person instruction following the pandemic. South Georgia returned to in-person instruction in the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. LEAs in North Georgia and the Metro region largely did not return to in-person instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. The return to in-person instruction benefited the South Georgia LEAs leading them to surpass results in other regions of the state. This has not been the historical trend with South Georgia LEAs

which often performed more poorly on assessments. In-person instruction rather than virtual instruction appeared more beneficial based upon these results.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,555	16,878	20.61%	22.93%	21.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,662	16,863	9.88%	11.91%	9.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,638	18,067	9.41%	9.69%	9.07%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

A review of the assessment data indicated that students in large metro and North Georgia LEAs performed much lower on assessments than students in South Georgia. Assessment data indicated that in South Georgia there were only 15 schools in the highest level of required support for the current Georgia ESEA plan compared to 38 in the Metro area and 21 in North Georgia. The Metro area has the highest density of SWD leading to lowered results for the entire state and slippage.

The difference between the LEAs in South Georgia with North Georgia and the Metro region could be attributed to a more rapid return to in-person instruction following the pandemic. South Georgia returned to in-person instruction in the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. LEAs in North Georgia and the Metro region largely did not return to in-person instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. The return to in-person instruction benefited the South Georgia LEAs leading them to surpass results in other regions of the state. This has not been the historical trend with South Georgia LEAs which often performed more poorly on assessments. In-person instruction rather than virtual instruction appeared more beneficial based upon these results.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response**3B - Required Actions**

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	66.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	82.77%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	72.19%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	58.98%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	66.52%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	66.40%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	68.00%	68.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	84.77%	84.77%	86.77%	86.77%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	74.19%	74.19%	76.19%	76.19%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	60.98%	60.98%	62.98%	62.98%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	68.52%	68.52%	70.52%	70.52%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	68.40%	68.40%	70.40%	70.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,742	1,925	1,525
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,199	1,652	1,074

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,737	1,913	1,514
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,025	1,270	1,055

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,199	1,742	65.00%	68.00%	68.83%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,652	1,925	84.62%	84.77%	85.82%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,074	1,525	70.08%	74.19%	70.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,025	1,737	56.02%	60.98%	59.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,270	1,913	66.86%	68.52%	66.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,055	1,514	71.07%	68.40%	69.68%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	23.89
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	32.01
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	24.16
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	24.22
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	24.01
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	15.96

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	19.89	17.89	15.89	13.89
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	28.01	26.01	24.01	22.01
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	20.16	18.16	16.16	14.16
Math	A <=	Grade 4	20.22	18.22	16.22	14.22
Math	B <=	Grade 8	20.01	18.01	16.01	14.01
Math	C <=	Grade HS	11.96	9.96	7.96	5.96

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR

Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	123,616	132,581	128,348

b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,898	16,915	14,009
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	41,886	53,052	47,643
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,959	3,141	2,945
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,276	572	281
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	832	1,025	861

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	123,498	132,251	142,746
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,878	16,863	18,067
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	51,061	45,094	46,887
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,622	3,156	3,393
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,733	608	470
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,822	1,054	1,168

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12.47%	36.28%	24.27	19.89	23.80	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.44%	42.38%	32.16	28.01	32.94	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.15%	39.41%	34.17	20.16	31.26	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.06%	45.90%	23.45	20.22	24.83	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.86%	36.48%	26.59	20.01	26.63	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9.07%	35.22%	23.76	11.96	26.16	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

A review of the assessment data indicated that students in large metro and North Georgia LEAs performed much lower on assessments than students in South Georgia. Assessment data indicated that in South Georgia there were only 15 schools in the highest level of required support for the current Georgia ESEA plan compared to 38 in the Metro area and 21 in North Georgia. The Metro area has the highest density of SWD leading to lowered results for the entire state and slippage.

The difference between the LEAs in South Georgia with North Georgia and the Metro region could be attributed to a more rapid return to in-person instruction following the pandemic. South Georgia returned to in-person instruction in the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. LEAs in North Georgia and the Metro region largely did not return to in-person instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. The return to in-person instruction benefited the South Georgia LEAs leading them to surpass results in other regions of the state. This has not been the historical trend with South Georgia LEAs which often performed more poorly on assessments. In-person instruction rather than virtual instruction appeared more beneficial based upon these results.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

A review of the assessment data indicated that students in large metro and North Georgia LEAs performed much lower on assessments than students in South Georgia. Assessment data indicated that in South Georgia there were only 15 schools in the highest level of required support for the current Georgia ESEA plan compared to 38 in the Metro area and 21 in North Georgia. The Metro area has the highest density of SWD leading to lowered results for the entire state and slippage.

The difference between the LEAs in South Georgia with North Georgia and the Metro region could be attributed to a more rapid return to in-person instruction following the pandemic. South Georgia returned to in-person instruction in the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. LEAs in North Georgia and the Metro region largely did not return to in-person instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. The return to in-person instruction benefited the South Georgia LEAs leading them to surpass results in other regions of the state. This has not been the historical trend with South Georgia LEAs which often performed more poorly on assessments. In-person instruction rather than virtual instruction appeared more beneficial based upon these results.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Website for reporting results is (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>).

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	18.52%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	16.50%	15.50%	15.50%	35.71%	30.21%
Data	57.14%	11.76%	35.71%	71.43%	33.33%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	27.21%	24.21%	21.21%	18.21%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiansights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

218

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	9	33.33%	27.21%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Georgia defines significant discrepancy as the percentage of LEAs 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 in comparison to the state rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The minimum cell size is ≥ 10 students with disabilities with expulsion or Out of School Suspension (OSS) > 10 days in the LEA, and the minimum n size is ≥ 30 students with disabilities cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. The formula used is the Rate Ratio = (LEA SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS > 10 Days). The LEA threshold score is a rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for 2 consecutive years.

Methodology: The percentage of LEAs with a significant discrepancy was determined including only LEAs that had ≥ 10 students with disabilities with Expulsion or Out of School Suspension (OSS) > 10 days (cell size) and at least 30 children with disabilities cumulatively enrolled (n size). There were 9 LEAs that met both criteria. Of the 9 LEAs included for analysis, there were none that met the rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for two consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

There were no LEAs that were significantly discrepant for 4a for the 2021-2022 school year. In the prior year when LEAs were discrepant, Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to review the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The review included topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As an example, the State reviewed documentation to determine the following:

- o if students removed greater than ten days were able to continue to receive services
- o if the local school system conducted a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior was the result of the disability; and
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports.

As a first step of the review, LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures using a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Discipline at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>). LEAs completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance to the legal requirements of discipline for students with disabilities. In the first part of of the Self-Rating, LEAs were provided with directions and the number of files (10) to be submitted for data review.

In Section 2 of the Self-Rating LEAs evaluated legal adherence to discipline rules for students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are compliant with the Discipline Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Discipline Rule." Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, and practices for the discipline of students with disabilities and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of disciplinary components (i.e., evidence of who is responsible for monitoring school data and when and how often it is done, evidence that PL implementation is monitored).

In section 3 LEAs were provided a listing of all required student file elements for the review: 1. Discipline records 2. Discipline meeting minutes 3. Parental notification for change in placement 4. Current IEP, current Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), if applicable 5. Evidence that Functional Behavioral Assessment and/or BIP were reviewed and/or updated 6. All Manifestation Determination Reviews with supporting evidence for team decision 7. Evidence parents were provided Procedural Safeguards 8. Evidence of services provided to the student during subsequent days of removal beyond 10 days, if applicable. In section 3 LEAs rated each file submitted using Yes, No, or N/A for items such as: a) The LEA submitted documentation that parents were notified of each Manifestation Determination Review (MDR)/IEP team meeting, if applicable. Each MDR from the current school year must be uploaded. b) The IEP team documented a written statement within the IEP that addresses the behavioral needs for a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others.

In section 4 LEAs were required to answer 7 additional questions for the files selected:

- 1) Does the student's IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS (In-School Suspension), OSS (Out-Of-School Suspension) and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?

6) Did the “removal” constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?

7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

The final section of the Self-Rating required LEAs to respond to a series of discussion questions such as:

1) Are there groups, settings, or schools disproportionately impacted by removals? What could be contributing to these gaps?

2) What interventions and supports appear to be most effective? What data was reviewed to support your findings?

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy resulting in noncompliance in the regulatory requirements.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Georgia is aware of the need to determine if its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology. In response to this requirement, an examination of different minimum cell sizes based on the currently reported submission and historical data has been conducted. Stakeholders have been consulted regarding the methodology. Georgia is also in the inaugural group for the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) Learning Circle - Sharing Significant Disproportionality Data to continue our methodology exploration with a larger peer group. Georgia has also discussed methodology with similarly situated states.

An examination of different minimum cell sizes yielded a negligible difference. For example, in the current submission when the cell size was decreased from 10 to 5 the number of LEAs increased from 9 to 17 LEAs. If there was no minimum cell size, there would be only 21 LEAs who had one or more students out of school suspended for more than 10 days. The submission reporting the 2020-2021 school year was highly atypical (very decreased discipline reported due to COVID) and was not analyzed. The submission reporting the 2019-2020 school year was very similar with a change from 7 to 11 LEAs. In fact, if there was no minimum cell size the number of LEAs would only increase to 18. There were fewer than 10% of LEAs in Georgia who suspended students Out of School for greater than 10 days.

In discussion with similarly situated states we have discussed different methodologies for examining significant discrepancy. These states have communicated difficulty in increasing the number of LEAs examined. Similar to Georgia, these states have a small number of LEAs with students who have out of school suspension for greater than 10 days. These states have also struggled with the number of LEAs they are examining for disproportionality. These discussions did not yield viable possibilities for increasing the number of LEAs reviewed. Georgia is pursuing additional methodologies through the DCASD technical assistance center.

Georgia’s data for this indicator reporting on the 2021-2022 school year reflected a more typical rate of LEAs reviewed than in the SPP/APR FFY 2021. Georgia’s data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID in the prior year’s report as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes was the smallest number reflected in many years. Georgia is aware that the methodology used in the significant discrepancy calculation cannot prohibit the analysis of a reasonable number of LEAs. The current report reflects a return to Georgia’s typical average of 10 to 15 LEAs reviewed based upon the calculation. As the 2020-2021 data was highly depressed and atypical, Georgia closely monitored discipline data and its interaction with the current discrepancy determination methodology in consultation with stakeholders to determine if changes were needed. The consultation with stakeholders did not yield a decision to change the methodology.

Georgia recognizes the importance of Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality to student outcomes and conducts analysis of all LEAs for Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality, even LEAs that do not meet the minimum cell (< 10) and n size (< 30). LEAs that do not meet the parameters for the calculation are not included in the calculations for SPP/APR and Significant Disproportionality reported to OSEP. The purpose of the additional analysis is to provide ongoing information to all LEAs to enable LEAs to monitor their current and longitudinal Significant

Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality status. Each LEA is provided with their current status on all areas of Significant Discrepancy and Disproportionality in a Disproportionality Application located in the secured Special Education Applications platform. LEA users must be provisioned to access the platform. The Disproportionality Application provides both current and longitudinal data for Significant Disproportionality and SPP/APR Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10. There are 10 tabs within the Disproportionality Application for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10 and all areas of Significant Disproportionality including Identification, Placement, and Discipline (i.e., Total Removals, > 10 days ISS, > 10 days OSS, < = 10 days ISS, < = 10 days OSS). Each tab within the application provides the calculation measures and parameters of the calculation (i.e., for 4A, the rate ratio of = 2.0 for 2 consecutive years is displayed). The tab also provides the LEA's current and longitudinal rate ratio or risk ratio calculations (i.e., current and two prior years of rate ratio for the entire LEA on 4A and a disaggregation by race/ethnicity on 4B). A series of color-coded banners are also used on the front facing tile of the Disproportionality Application as well as inside the Application. The color banner schematic is: Blue – LEA's Rate Ratio is ≥ 2.0 , but there are no consequences for LEA because there were < 10 (cell) or < 30 students (n size) to meet the minimum cell and n size. Yellow – LEA's Rate Ratio is ≥ 2.0 , and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, but there are no consequences because this is the first year and two years are required for Significant Discrepancy. Red – LEA's Rate Ratio is ≥ 2.0 , and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, there are consequences for the LEA because this is the second consecutive year.

4A - OSEP Response

The State reported it is planning to revise its methodology for determining if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, to be reported in a future SPP/APR. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts. However, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State included 3.9 percent of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported, "Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID in the prior year's report as discipline data is lag data." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	5.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	18.18%	15.38%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

217

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	10	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Georgia defines significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity as the number of LEAs 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 by race/ethnicity in comparison to the state rate for all SWD with > expulsion or suspension of > 10 days. The LEA minimum cell size is ≥ 10 students with disabilities with Expulsion or Suspension of Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group in the LEA, and the LEA minimum n size is ≥ 30 students with disabilities in the same specific racial/ethnic group cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. The formula used is the Rate Ratio (LEA SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS by race/ethnicity > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS > 10 Days). The LEA threshold score is a rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for 2 consecutive years.

Methodology: The number of LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity was determined using only LEAs that had both one subgroup ≥ 10 students with disabilities with expulsion or suspension Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup (cell size) and the 30 children with disabilities in the same ethnic or racial subgroup cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. There were 10 LEAs that met the criteria and comprised the number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size. Of the 10 LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n size, 1 met the rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for two consecutive years and was classified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to review the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. An LEA identified as having significant discrepancy participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The review included topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As an example, the State reviewed documentation to determine the following:

- o if students removed greater than ten days were able to continue to receive services
- o if the local school system conducted a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior was the result of the disability; and
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports.

As a first step of the review, an LEA identified as having significant discrepancy reviewed its policies, practices, and procedures using a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Discipline at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>). The LEA completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance to the legal requirements of discipline for students with disabilities. In the first part of the Self-Rating, the LEA was provided with directions and the number of files (10) to be submitted for data review.

In Section 2 of the Self-Rating an LEA evaluated legal adherence to discipline rules for students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) “The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are compliant with the Discipline Rule,” b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Discipline Rule.” Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the discipline of students with disabilities and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of disciplinary components (i.e., evidence of who is responsible for monitoring school data and when and how often it is done, evidence that PL implementation is monitored).

In section 3 the LEA was provided a listing of all required student file elements for the review: 1. Discipline records 2. Discipline meeting minutes 3. Parental notification for change in placement 4. Current IEP, current Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), if applicable 5. Evidence that Functional Behavioral Assessment and/or BIP were reviewed and/or updated 6. All Manifestation Determination Reviews with supporting evidence for team decision 7. Evidence parents were provided Procedural Safeguards 8. Evidence of services provided to the student during subsequent days of removal beyond 10 days, if applicable. In section 3 LEAs rated each file submitted using Yes, No, or N/A for items such as: a) The LEA submitted documentation that parents were notified of each Manifestation Determination Review/IEP team meeting, if applicable. Each MDR from the current school year must be uploaded. b) The IEP team documented a written statement within the IEP that addresses the behavioral needs for a child whose behavior impedes the child’s learning or that of others.

In section 4 LEAs were required to answer 7 additional questions for the file selection:

- 1) Does the student’s IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS, OSS and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 6) Did the “removal” constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?
- 7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

The concluding section of the Self-Rating required the LEA to respond to a series of discussion questions such as:

- 1) Are there groups, settings, or schools disproportionately impacted by removals? What could be contributing to these gaps?
- 2) What interventions and supports appear to be most effective? What data was reviewed to support your findings?

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with the LEA during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy resulting in noncompliance in the regulatory requirements. The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements after the review 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Georgia is aware of the need to determine if its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology. In response to this requirement, an examination of different minimum cell sizes based on the currently reported submission and historical data has been conducted. Stakeholders have been consulted regarding the methodology. Georgia is also in the inaugural group for the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) Learning Circle - Sharing Significant Disproportionality Data to continue our methodology exploration with a larger peer group. Georgia has also discussed methodology with similarly situated states.

An examination of different minimum cell sizes yielded a negligible difference. For example, in the current submission when the cell size was decreased from 10 to 5 the number of LEAs increased from 10 to 17 LEAs. The submission reporting the 2020-2021 school year was highly atypical (very decreased discipline reported due to COVID) and was not analyzed. The submission reporting the 2019-2020 school year was very similar with a change from 13 to 17 LEAs with 5 instead of 10 as the cell size.

In discussion with similarly situated states we have discussed different methodologies for examining significant discrepancy. These states have communicated difficulty in increasing the number of LEAs examined. Similar to Georgia, these states have a small number of LEAs with students who have out of school suspension for greater than 10 days. These states have also struggled with the number of LEAs they are examining for disproportionality. These discussions did not yield viable possibilities for increasing the number of LEAs reviewed. Georgia is pursuing additional methodologies through the DCASD technical assistance center.

Georgia's data for this indicator reporting on the 2021-2022 school year reflected a more typical rate of LEAs reviewed than in the SPP/APR FFY 2021. Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID in the prior year's report as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes was the smallest number reflected in many years. Georgia is aware that the methodology used in the significant discrepancy calculation cannot prohibit the analysis of a reasonable number of LEAs. The current report reflects a return to Georgia's typical average of 10 to 15 LEAs reviewed based upon the calculation. As the 2020-2021 data was highly depressed and atypical, Georgia closely monitored discipline data and its interaction with the current discrepancy determination methodology in consultation with stakeholders to determine if changes were needed. The consultation with stakeholders did not yield a decision to change the methodology.

Georgia recognizes the importance of Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality to student outcomes and conducts analysis of all LEAs for Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality, even LEAs that do not meet the minimum cell (< 10) and n size (< 30). LEAs that do not meet the parameters for the calculation are not included in the calculations for SPP/APR and Significant Disproportionality reported to OSEP. The purpose of the additional analysis is to provide ongoing information to all LEAs to enable LEAs to monitor their current and longitudinal Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality status. Each LEA is provided with their current status on all areas of Significant Discrepancy and Disproportionality in a Disproportionality Application located in the secured Special Education Applications platform. LEA users must be provisioned to access the platform. The Disproportionality Application provides both current and longitudinal data for Significant Disproportionality and SPP/APR Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10. There are 10 tabs within the Disproportionality Application for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10 and all areas of Significant Disproportionality including Identification, Placement, and Discipline (i.e., Total Removals, > 10 days ISS, > 10 days OSS, < = 10 days ISS, < = 10 days OSS). Each tab within the application provides the calculation measures and parameters of the calculation (i.e., for 4A, the rate ratio of = 2.0 for 2 consecutive years is displayed). The tab also provides the LEA's current and longitudinal rate ratio or risk ratio calculations (i.e., current and two prior years of rate ratio for the entire LEA on 4A and a disaggregation by race/ethnicity on 4B). A series of color-coded banners are also used on the front facing tile of the Disproportionality Application as well as inside the Application. The color banner schematic is: Blue – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, but there are no consequences for LEA because there were < 10 (cell) or < 30 students (n size) to meet the minimum cell and n size. Yellow – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, but there are no consequences because this is the first year and two years are required for Significant Discrepancy. Red – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, there are consequences for the LEA because this is the second consecutive year.

4B - OSEP Response

The State reported it is planning to revise its methodology for determining if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, to be reported in a future SPP/APR. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts. However, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State included 4.4 percent of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported, "Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID in the prior year's report as discipline data is lag data." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	65.40%	65.50%		62.73%	63.73%
A	62.73%	Data	64.06%	63.04%	62.73%	62.41%	61.76%
B	2019	Target <=	14.10%	14.00%		16.58%	16.58%
B	16.58%	Data	15.20%	16.26%	16.58%	17.17%	17.37%
C	2019	Target <=	1.50%	1.38%		1.48%	1.48%
C	1.48%	Data	1.77%	1.54%	1.48%	1.43%	1.40%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	64.73%	65.73%	66.73%	67.73%
Target B <=	16.08%	15.58%	15.08%	15.08%
Target C <=	1.38%	1.38%	1.28%	1.28%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers

- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	220,202
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	137,064
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	36,768
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,015

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	314
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	505

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	137,064	220,202	61.76%	64.73%	62.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	36,768	220,202	17.37%	16.08%	16.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,834	220,202	1.40%	1.38%	1.29%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	46.40%	46.60%		32.54%	32.54%
A	Data	41.94%	41.76%	32.54%	29.36%	28.27%
B	Target <=	23.00%	22.50%		41.32%	41.32%
B	Data	27.44%	29.26%	41.32%	42.08%	44.77%
C	Target <=				1.63%	1.63%
C	Data				1.63%	1.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22

- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	32.54%
B	2019	41.32%
C	2020	1.63%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	33.54%	34.54%	35.54%	37.54%
Target B <=	40.32%	39.32%	38.32%	37.32%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.53%	1.53%	1.43%	1.33%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,599	5,498	1,064	10,161
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	651	1,715	432	2,798
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,927	2,315	389	4,631
b2. Number of children attending separate school	8	7	6	21
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	1	1	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	27	38	6	71

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,798	10,161	28.27%	33.54%	27.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,654	10,161	44.77%	40.32%	45.80%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	71	10,161	1.15%	1.53%	0.70%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

Georgia's special education pre-k population increased by 843 students from the prior school year. Georgia does not have universal pre-k and has large rural areas that do not have regular preschool programming for students. LEAs in Georgia have bridged the gap in programming with special education provided to students in small group special education settings. While these settings are meeting the needs of students with disabilities in the 3- and 4-year-old range, there is also an increase in the number of students in separate special education classes leading to slippage on this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	78.60%	78.60%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%
A1	68.70%	Data	79.75%	80.53%	80.52%	85.40%	82.85%

A2	2008	Target >=	61.80%	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
A2	57.10%	Data	62.01%	62.16%	54.86%	55.06%	51.05%
B1	2008	Target >=	81.40%	81.50%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
B1	63.90%	Data	82.58%	83.38%	82.16%	87.98%	85.37%
B2	2008	Target >=	37.20%	37.30%	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%
B2	24.90%	Data	47.44%	48.08%	44.34%	47.93%	44.78%
C1	2008	Target >=	78.00%	78.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%
C1	71.20%	Data	79.74%	80.56%	80.08%	86.48%	84.54%
C2	2008	Target >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
C2	65.70%	Data	71.04%	71.60%	65.01%	64.68%	63.63%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target A2 >=	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%
Target B2 >=	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	72.10%	72.20%	72.20%	72.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to

five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia’s Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

6,663

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	116	1.74%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	703	10.55%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,526	37.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,858	27.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,460	21.91%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,384	5,203	82.85%	83.00%	84.26%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,318	6,663	51.05%	65.00%	49.80%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	1.29%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	741	11.12%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,867	43.03%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,267	34.02%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	702	10.54%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,134	5,961	85.37%	85.00%	86.13%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,969	6,663	44.78%	48.00%	44.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	117	1.76%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	608	9.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,869	28.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,199	33.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,870	28.07%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,068	4,793	84.54%	83.00%	84.87%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6	4,069	6,663	63.63%	72.10%	61.07%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> <i>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Preschool students are making progress as evidenced by meeting improvement targets for A1, B1, C1, and B2. Unfortunately, the level of gain was not equivalent to meeting age expectations upon exit. The lack of universal pre-k limits the availability of preschool settings and exposure to typical peers which adversely impacts the level of improvement of functioning in children exiting preschool. Teacher retention is also adversely impacting student progress. Georgia teacher retention data for special education teachers (https://georgiainsights.gadoe.org/Dashboards/Pages/EducatorPipeline-Teachers.aspx) indicated retention levels that were adversely impacting the stability of effective instruction for students with disabilities. Teacher retention for special education teachers in 2023 was 89.81% which represents a decrease of 1.8 percentage points from 2022. The 2023 retention rate of special education teachers in charter schools was 84.54%, which was 5.23 percentage points below the state average. The 2023 retention rate for Metro LEAs is 88.35, which was 1.46 percentage points below the state average. Within the Metro LEAs group, serving large numbers of special education students, individual LEA retention rates were lower (i.e., Atlanta Public Schools (80.79%), Fulton County (85.02%). Other Georgia LEAs, serving large numbers of students, also had retention rates that were lower than the state average (i.e., Richmond County (86.58), Muscogee County (85.22%). A by-product of special education teacher attrition was an increased number of new special education teachers many of whom are earning their teaching credential through alternative preparation programs. These teachers enter the field with a lack of preparation in providing effective instruction. Georgia is actively working toward resolving the issue of teacher retention with the nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support for LEAs in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families.
C2	Preschool students are making progress as evidenced by meeting improvement targets for A1, B1, C1, and B2. Unfortunately, the level of gain was not equivalent to meeting age expectations upon exit. The lack of universal pre-k limits the availability of preschool settings and exposure to typical peers which adversely impacts the level of improvement of functioning in children exiting preschool. Teacher retention is also adversely impacting student progress. Georgia teacher retention data for special education teachers (https://georgiainsights.gadoe.org/Dashboards/Pages/EducatorPipeline-Teachers.aspx) indicated retention levels that were adversely impacting the stability of effective instruction for students with disabilities. Teacher retention for special education teachers in 2023 was 89.81% which represents a decrease of 1.8 percentage points from 2022. The 2023 retention rate of special education teachers in charter schools was 84.54%, which was 5.23 percentage points below the state average. The 2023 retention rate for Metro LEAs is 88.35, which was 1.46 percentage points below the state average. Within the Metro LEAs group, serving large numbers of special education students, individual LEA retention rates were lower (i.e., Atlanta Public Schools (80.79%), Fulton County (85.02%). Other Georgia LEAs, serving large numbers of students, also had retention rates that were lower than the state average (i.e., Richmond County (86.58), Muscogee County (85.22%). A by-product of special education teacher attrition was an increased number of new special education teachers many of whom are earning their teaching credential through alternative preparation programs. These teachers enter the field with a lack of preparation in providing effective instruction. Georgia is actively working toward resolving the issue of teacher retention with the nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support for LEAs in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Data for Indicator 7 are collected at the student level by each LEA that provides special education services to young children. No statewide assessment exists for young children (ages 3, 4, and 5 in PK). Therefore, LEAs collect this data using tools such as checklists, observation tools and standardized assessments. LEAs were asked to provide the names of the assessments utilized and reported the following: Formal: Developmental Profile 4 (DP-4), Test of Early Language Development-Fourth Edition (TELD-4), Clinical Assessment of Articulation and Phonology-Second Edition (CAAP-2), Developmental Assessment of Young Children-Second Edition (DAYC-2), Preschool Language Scale-Fifth Edition (PLS-5), Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-Third Edition (GFTA-3), Fluharty-2, Battelle Developmental Inventory-Third Edition (BDI-3), Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales-Third Edition (VABS-3), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Fifth Edition (PPVT-5), Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH), Brigance Early Childhood Screening, Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP), Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test -Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) and Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test – Fourth Edition (ROWPVT-4). Informal: Teacher Checklist, Speech-language Samples, Teacher Reports, Childhood History, Behavior Checklist, and Tier information.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice

- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.50%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	70.00%	71.00%		88.60%	88.60%
Data	71.00%	73.00%	88.50%	90.21%	86.95%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	88.60%	89.60%	90.60%	91.60%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
32,201	36,703	86.95%	88.60%	87.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 2022-2023 school year, Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirements. All families of children with disabilities had the opportunity to participate in the survey, including parents of preschool students. Parents were all offered the same survey regardless of the grade level of the student allowing the analysis procedures to be valid and reliable. Paper copies were also available upon request. The survey was also available online in Spanish. The survey is available for participation online to all parents of children with disabilities age 3-21 in Georgia beginning in January each year and ending May 31st each year. The survey is publicized by each school system 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 are included with the data reported for all parent responses.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

230,363

Percentage of respondent parents

15.93%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	15.40%	15.93%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Georgia used a band of + or - 5 percentage points in parental response rate discrepancy based upon racial/ethnic representation and grade of students receiving special education services. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup, a representative rate of parent response would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Georgia examined the representativeness of the respondents to the Parent Survey based upon the percentages of students served by race/ethnicity. In examining variance, Georgia used a band of + or - 5% percentage points in response rate based upon racial/ethnic representation of students receiving special education services based on the Federal Child Count. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup based on the Federal Child Count, a representative rate of response in the group would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents.

These data revealed that a higher percentage of the parents for White SWD responded to the survey (47.78%) compared to the percentage of White SWD enrolled (37.20%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of +10.58. A lower percentage of the parents of Black SWD responded to the survey (33.41%) as compared to Black SWD enrolled (39.10%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of -5.69. A lower percentage of the parents in the Hispanic group of Hispanic SWD responded to the survey (10.67%) as compared to Hispanic SWD enrolled (16.70%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of -6.03. All other race/ethnicity survey participation and enrollments were within the + or - 5 percentage points range. The response and enrollment rates were respectively reported as: Asian 2.01% and 2.20%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0.09% and 0.10%, American Indian 0.47% and 0.20%, and More than One Race 5.57% and 4.60%. Based upon the discrepancy in representativeness, a nonresponse bias analysis of results was conducted. A thorough analysis of the nonresponse bias for race/ethnicity based upon the +/- 5 percentage points threshold indicated no significant impact on the overall analysis of the survey responses.

Georgia also completed an analysis of respondents based upon the grade of the student represented in the survey in comparison to the Federal Child Count with a response rate band of + or -5 percentage points per grade level. Grade was selected using the stakeholder input process. For example, if there were 3,297 respondents with students with disabilities in grade 5 for 8.98% of the total survey, the percent of students in grade 5 in the Child Count should also be 8.98% within +/- 5 percentage points, and it was with 8.10% reported. No response rates by grade were outside of the band of +/- 5% percentage points. The following represents the percent of the survey responses by grade, percent of enrollment in Child Count by grade, and the difference between the percents, respectively: Pre-K – 6.68, 4.41 (2.27), K – 6.94, 4.81 (2.13), Grade 1 - 7.87, 6.13 (1.74), Grade 2 - 8.65, 6.80 (1.85), Grade 3 – 8.85, 7.44 (1.41), Grade 4 - 8.64, 7.85 (.79), Grade 5 – 8.98, 8.10 (.88), Grade 6 - 7.06, 8.26 (-1.20), Grade 7 – 6.97, 8.44 (-1.47), Grade 8 – 6.78, 8.68 (-1.90), Grade 9 – 6.35, 9.98 (-3.63), Grade 10 - 5.59, 8.42 (-2.83), Grade 11 – 5.04, 6.60 (-1.56), and Grade 12 - 5.59, 6.78 (-1.19).

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

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

The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and provide 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 from the GaDOE 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. Strategies include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

Georgia has intensified efforts to increase the representativeness of survey respondents. The Georgia Department of Education and LEAs publicize the availability of the survey to all families. LEA 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 across all demographic groups. SEA staff will analyze the real-time data of surveys completed in the current year and contact Special Education Directors to examine their data available in the Special Education Dashboard by school. The demographic data are not provided 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 system-level 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. Georgia has also added additional internal data reports that can be used by GaDOE DSESS staff to provide additional reminders and supports to LEAs who are not having a high level of response.

Georgia will place an emphasis on attaining increased participation from the parents of students in the SWD Black/African American and Hispanic subgroups based on the current analysis. Georgia is adding an additional report to monitor the regional collection of parent survey results while the survey is available to examine areas of the state in which participation is lower. LEAs in these regions of the state with lower representative participation can then be provided with additional support from the DSESS.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The response rate in Georgia for FFY 2022 has increased from the FFY 2021 response rate. The trend of participation has been increasing for several years. In FFY 2022, there were 36,703 respondents out of 230,363 possible respondents (based on the October 1 Child Count). The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and provide 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 from the GaDOE 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. Strategies to address underrepresented groups include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. To reach the historically underrepresented Hispanic subgroup a Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

An analysis metric of +/- 5 percentage points between racial/ethnic representation and age (grade) representation of the Parent Survey parental respondents and the representation of SWD served based on the Federal Child Count was used. The analysis of the response rates indicated that response rates were not comparable to the rates of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity in the White, Black/African American, and Hispanic subgroups based upon the Federal Child Count. A separate analysis based upon age (grade) represented in the Federal Child Count yielded no deviation of +/- 5 percentage points. The parents of the White SWD subgroup demonstrated a +10.58 rate of response (47.78%) relative to the representation of the White subgroup (37.2%) in the Federal Child Count. The parents of the Black/African American SWD subgroup demonstrated a -5.69 rate of response (33.41%) relative to the representation of the Black/African American subgroup (39.1%) in the Federal Child Count. The parents of the Hispanic subgroup demonstrated a -6.03 rate of response (47.78%) relative to the representation of the Hispanic subgroup (37.2%) in the Federal Child Count.

To determine if nonresponse bias could be significantly impacting the results of the Survey, we considered both the extent to which any subgroups were under or overrepresented in our survey along with the extent to which these subgroups differed in the outcome of interest in our survey, Parent Satisfaction. Based on the state's threshold for representativeness, our response data were representative with respect to student grade but not representative with respect to certain student race/ethnicity subgroups. Therefore, we assessed for nonresponse bias by disaggregating the overall Survey results and attaining a Parent Satisfaction score for the White, Black/African American, and Hispanic subgroups.

The disaggregated results of the Survey did not vary by more than +/- 5% percentage points from the overall Survey results for the racial/ethnic groups having either under or over representation. Further, none of the three subgroups analyzed differed by +/- 5 percentage points in their respective Survey mean Parent Satisfaction scores. Thus, our overall survey results did not appear to have issues with nonresponse bias with respect to student race/ethnicity based on this initial examination.

The methodology for attaining the overall Parent Satisfaction percentage was to use the Mean of the 10 items on the Parent Survey. For each survey respondent, a score was calculated by summing the response choices, which range from 1 to 6 (1 = Very Strongly Disagree/Never and 6 = Very Strongly Agree/Always) and dividing by the number of responses, thus calculating a mean score for each respondent. If the mean score was 4 or above, the respondent was determined to have a high level of satisfaction. The number of parents with a score of 4 or above is then divided by the total number of parents responding to determine the Satisfaction level, expressed as a percentage. The overall Parent Satisfaction Survey percentage was 87.73% with 32,201 of 36,703 respondents determined to have a high level of parental satisfaction.

The White subgroup had a total of 17,538 respondents with 15,597 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of 88.93%, which is 1.20 percentage points above the overall 87.73% Survey results. The Hispanic subgroup had a total of 3,915 respondents with 3,543 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of 90.50%, which is 2.77 percentage points above the overall Survey results. The Black/African American subgroup had a total of 12,262 respondents with 10,497 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of 85.61%, which is 2.12 percentage points below the overall Survey results. Although the response rate and satisfaction score of the Black/African American subgroup did not meet the +/- 5 percentage points threshold, there is concern that the subgroup had the lowest participation and satisfaction rates. As a result, Georgia will place an emphasis on attaining increased participation from the subgroup. Georgia is adding an additional report to monitor the regional collection of parent survey results while the survey is available to examine areas of the state in which participation is lower. LEAs in these regions of the state can then be provided with additional support from the DSESS.

Georgia will continue to minimize the possibility of nonresponse bias by partnering with Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizing the survey, and assisting

parents with questions regarding their participation. A Spanish version of the survey is also available in the online and paper format. Finally, an analysis of individual LEA results for participation has been completed and is being used by Parent Mentors in Georgia to increase participation at the LEA level.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Georgia reported in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR that the data were not from a parental response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. As a result, Georgia will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and provide 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 from the GaDOE 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. Strategies include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

Georgia has intensified efforts to increase the representativeness of the parental survey respondents. The Georgia Department of Education and LEAs publicize the availability of the survey to all families. LEA 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 across all demographic groups. SEA staff will analyze the real-time data of surveys completed in the current year and contact Special Education Directors to examine their data available in the Special Education Dashboard by school. The demographic data are not provided 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 system-level 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.

Georgia will place an emphasis on attaining increased participation from the parental respondents in the Black/African American and Hispanic subgroups based on the current analysis. Georgia is adding an additional report to monitor the regional collection of parent survey results while the survey is available to examine areas of the state in which participation is lower. LEAs in these regions of the state with lower representative participation can then be provided with additional support from the DSESS.

As indicated in the FFY2022 report, an analysis revealed that a higher percentage of the parents of White SWD responded to the survey (47.78%) compared to the percentage of White SWD enrolled (37.20%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of +10.58. A lower percentage of the parents of Black SWD responded to the survey (33.41%) as compared to Black SWD enrolled (39.10%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of -5.69. A lower percentage of the parents of Hispanic SWD responded to the survey (10.67%) as compared to Hispanic SWD enrolled (16.70%). This is a difference between the percentage point rates of -6.03. All other race/ethnicity survey participation and enrollments were within the + or - 5 percentage points range. The response and enrollment rates were respectively reported as: Asian 2.01% and 2.20%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0.09% and 0.10%, American Indian 0.47% and 0.20%, and More than One Race 5.57% and 4.60%.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

14

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	213	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups (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 at the LEA level: (1) Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Ethnic/Racial Subgroup ≥ 10 , $n \geq 30$ LEA enrollment in a Specific Ethnic/Racial Subgroup.

Georgia has a minimum cell size of ≥ 10 and minimum n-size of ≥ 30 . Only LEAs that meet both criteria are evaluated at the LEA level for disproportionality by the State and included in the Georgia number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size.

The risk ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires:

(A) If ≥ 10 children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group, such as Hispanic, in the LEA are identified as SWD, and
 (B) ≥ 30 students enrolled in the LEA are in the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk.

The denominator of the equation will either be a comparison group at the LEA level or a state comparison group.

If the LEA has (C) ≥ 10 children in the LEA in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) identified as students with disabilities, and
 (D) ≥ 30 or more children enrolled in the LEA in all other racial ethnic groups (not Hispanic), the LEA comparison group will be used in the calculation of the Risk Ratio.

If the LEA does not meet the conditions of C and D then a state comparison group is used for the denominator with

(C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) of students identified as students with disabilities in the state, and

(D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) in the state. The use of the state comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

The calculation is A/B divided by C/D, with the specific LEA numbers for each component or state numbers for C/D if applicable for the Alternate Risk Ratio. LEAs with a Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years are included in Georgia's number of LEAs with disproportionate representation.

Methodology: Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified as students with disabilities in the same ethnic/racial group and 30 students enrolled in the same racial/ethnic category with a risk ratio ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation for the State. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students with disabilities in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, an total enrollment of 500 children in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 3.0 for two consecutive years. One LEA had a risk ratio of ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years.

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 determined disproportionate representation by first examining the data. One LEA had a Risk Ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years for identification as a student with disabilities receiving special education and related services in any racial/ethnic group considered to have disproportionate representation. Georgia then utilized a Comprehensive Compliance Review to examine local policies, procedures, and practices to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addressed the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation, reevaluation, and eligibility determination processes.

As a first step, the LEA identified as having disproportionate representation for identification as a student with a disability reviewed its policies, practices, and procedures using a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Identification at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>). The LEA completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance of the appropriate identification of students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are in compliance with the Child Find Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Eligibility Determination Rule." Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to the LEA. The LEA provided evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. The LEA uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the implementation of Child Find and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets for evaluating and reevaluating students for special education. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of all components.

In the next part of the Self-Rating, the LEA completed a Student Referral Chart. The chart required the number of students referred in the prior school year, number of students found eligible, and the number of students found ineligible. Next, LEAs were required to upload a representative number of student files (based upon LEA size group) found eligible for special education in the LEA. The listing also had to include a specified number of students who were determined ineligible for special education. The minimum number of files reviewed was 10. For all files uploaded, the LEA provided the

following information: student name, gender, grade level, school, race/ethnicity, name of interventions, duration of intervention, frequency of monitoring, reason for referral, found eligible y or n, and eligibility category.

The third part of the Self-Rating was an Individual Student Records Review which required the LEAs to answer Y, N, or N/A to items for each individual file submitted which included: a) Evaluations are provided in the child's native language, b) The LEA considered exclusionary factors, lack of appropriate instruction in reading, or limited English proficiency [for eligibility determinations], c) The eligibility report documents the area(s) of disability and aligns with the state rules and regulations for the specific eligibility category.

The final portion of the Self-Rating was a Compliance Review Discussion Questions section for the team to complete. LEA responded to items such as: a) What is the composition of the LEA by race, gender? What is the composition of the LEA's students with disabilities by race, gender? b) Discuss the eligibility determination process that is being implemented in your LEA. How is your LEA implementing the process with fidelity and integrity for all eligibility categories and specifically in the area of disproportionality findings in your LEA.

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, the LEA was not identified as having disproportionate representation resulting from non-compliant policies, procedures, and practices.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	1.46%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	2.90%	5.61%	3.54%	1.46%	1.86%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

14

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
36	8	213	1.86%	0%	3.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The slippage was the result of an increase of five LEAs meeting the numerical criteria for disproportionate representation (minimum cell and n size) in the current reporting period and an increase of four LEAs that had disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification. The current year's data (FFY 2022) reflects the impact of an increase in students identified as students with disabilities (5,468) from the prior reporting year and thus more LEAs identified. Teacher retention is also adversely impacting student identification for special education. Georgia teacher retention data for special education teachers (<https://georgiainsights.gadoe.org/Dashboards/Pages/EducatorPipeline-Teachers.aspx>) indicated retention levels that were adversely impacting the stability of effective identification of students with disabilities. Teacher retention for special education teachers in 2023 was 89.81% which represents a decrease of 1.8 percentage points from 2022. The 2023 retention rate of special education teachers in charter schools was 84.54%, which was 5.23 percentage points below the state average. The 2023 retention rate for Metro LEAs is 88.35, which was 1.46 percentage points below the state average. Within the Metro LEAs group, serving large numbers of special education students, individual LEA retention rates were lower (i.e., Atlanta Public Schools (80.79%), Fulton County (85.02%). Other Georgia LEAs, serving large numbers of students, also had retention rates that were lower than the state average (i.e., Richmond County (86.58), Muscogee County (85.22%). A by-product of special education teacher attrition was an increased number of new special education teachers many of whom are earning their teaching credential through alternative preparation programs. These teachers enter the field with a lack of preparation in recognizing and identifying the characteristics of students with disabilities. Georgia is actively working toward resolving the issue of teacher retention with the nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support for LEAs in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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 the special education categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impaired, Speech Language Impaired, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Emotional Behavioral Disorders by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Ethnic/Racial Subgroup in one of the specified categories of special education above ≥ 10 (minimum cell size) and $n \geq 30$ LEA enrollment in the same Specific Ethnic/Racial Subgroup.

Only LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n sizes above are evaluated at the LEA level for disproportionality by the State for inclusion in the Georgia number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size. There were 215 LEAs meeting the criteria.

The Risk Ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires:

- (A) ≥ 10 children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group (i.e., White) in one of the specified categories of special education (i.e., Other Health Impaired), and
- (B) 30 or more students enrolled in the LEA are the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk.

The denominator of the equation will either be a comparison group at the LEA level or a state comparison group.

If the LEA has:

- (C) ≥ 10 children in the LEA in all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) identified in the specified category of disability (Other Health Impaired), and
- (D) 30 or more children enrolled in the LEA in all other racial ethnic groups (not White), the LEA comparison group will be used in the calculation of the Risk Ratio.

If the LEA does not meet the conditions of C and D, then a state comparison group is used for the denominator with:

- (C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) of students identified in the specified category of special education (Other Health Impaired) in the State, and
- (D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) enrolled in the State. The use of the State comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

The calculation is A/B divided by C/D, with the specific LEA numbers for each component or state numbers for C/D if applicable for the Alternate Risk

Ratio. LEAs with a Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years are included in Georgia's number of LEAs with disproportionate representation.

Methodology: Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified in the same ethnic/racial group in the specific category of special education and 30 students enrolled in a specific racial/ethnic category and at the LEA level with a risk ratio ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of LEAs for the State that have disproportionate representation. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students in the special education category of Other Health Impaired in the White racial subgroup, a total enrollment of 500 children in the White racial subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 4.5 for two consecutive years. There were 36 LEAs that met the threshold level with a risk ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years.

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 used a Comprehensive Compliance Review process to review local policies, procedures, and practices to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addressed the following areas: child find, evaluation, reevaluations, and eligibility determination processes.

As a first step, LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures using a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Identification at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>). LEAs completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance of the appropriate identification of students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are in compliance with the Child Find Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Eligibility Determination Rule." Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the implementation of Child Find and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets for evaluating and reevaluating students for special education. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of all components.

In the next part of the Self-Rating, LEAs completed a Student Referral Chart. The chart required the number of students referred in the prior school year, number of students found eligible, and the number of students found ineligible. Next, LEAs were required to upload a representative number of student files (based upon LEA size group) found eligible in the LEA for the specific area of disproportionate representation identified (i.e., Specific Learning Disability). The listing also had to include a specified number of students determined ineligible for special education. The minimum number of files reviewed was 10. For all files uploaded, the LEA provided the following information: student name, gender, grade level, school, race/ethnicity, name of interventions, duration of intervention, frequency of monitoring, reason for referral, found eligible y or n, and eligibility category.

The third part of the Self-Rating was an Individual Student Records Review which required the LEAs to answer Y, N, or N/A to items for each individual file submitted which included: a) Evaluations are provided in the child's native language, b) The LEA considered exclusionary factors, lack of appropriate instruction in reading, or limited English proficiency [for eligibility determinations], c) The eligibility report documents the area(s) of disability and aligns with the state rules and regulations for the specific eligibility category.

The final portion of the Self-Rating was a Compliance Review Discussion Questions section for the team to complete. LEA responded to items such as: a) What is the composition of the LEA by race, gender? What is the composition of the LEA's students with disabilities by race, gender? b) Discuss the eligibility determination process that is being implemented in your LEA. How is your LEA implementing the process with fidelity and integrity for all eligibility categories and specifically in the area of disproportionality findings in your LEA.

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, 8 of the 36 LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation resulting from non-compliant policies, procedures, and practices.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Four LEAs were determined to be significantly disproportionate with policies, procedures, and practices which contributed to the disproportionate representation and were not compliant with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646 after a review conducted by the Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and establish full implementation of regulatory requirements 34 C.F.R. § 300.646. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of prereferral, evaluation, and eligibility determination processes for special education.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The CAP was due within 45 days of notification of noncompliance.
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review which contained the Self-Report. Policies, procedures, and practices were required to be in 100% compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. OSEP QA 23-01 dated July 24, 2023.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant individual case data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff

reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (individual case data) came into compliance.

6) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student eligibility reports (reports written following the initial collection of records in which noncompliance was determined). The reports were required to demonstrate evidence of 100% compliance. Additionally, the implementation of updated professional learning updated supervision and monitoring plans were required. The Regulatory review conducted by GaDOE of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements previously cited as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant regulatory data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA regulatory data came into compliance.

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

Four LEAs were determined to be significantly disproportionate with policies, procedures, and practices which contributed to the disproportionate representation and were not legally compliant with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646 after a review conducted by the Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and establish full implementation of regulatory requirements 34 C.F.R. § 300.646. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of prereferral, evaluation, and eligibility determination processes for special education.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The CAP was due within 45 days of notification of noncompliance.
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review which contained the Self-Report. Policies, procedures, and practices were required to be in 100% compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant individual case data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (individual case data) came into compliance.
- 6) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student eligibility reports (reports written following the initial collection of records in which noncompliance was determined). The reports were required to demonstrate evidence of 100% compliance. Additionally, the implementation of updated professional learning updated supervision and monitoring plans were required. The regulatory review conducted by GaDOE of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements previously cited as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant regulatory data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA regulatory data came into compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the four (4) districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 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 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 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 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Four LEAs were determined to be significantly disproportionate with policies, procedures, and practices which contributed to the disproportionate representation and were not legally compliant with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646 after a review conducted by the Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and establish full implementation of regulatory requirements 34 C.F.R. § 300.646. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of prereferral, evaluation, and eligibility determination processes for special education.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The CAP was due within 45 days of notification of noncompliance.

- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review which contained the Self-Report. Policies, procedures, and practices were required to be in 100% compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant individual case data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (individual case data) came into compliance.
- 6) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student eligibility reports (reports written following the initial collection of records in which noncompliance was determined). The reports were required to demonstrate evidence of 100% compliance. Additionally, the implementation of updated professional learning updated supervision and monitoring plans were required. The Regulatory review conducted by GaDOE of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements previously cited as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant regulatory data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA regulatory data came into compliance.

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.91%	98.54%	98.80%	98.16%	98.13%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
37,858	37,119	98.13%	100%	98.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

739

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.

Georgia had 739 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: 248

Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days: 186

Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days: 106

Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days: 199

Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner): 76 (10.28%)

Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists): 592 (80.11%)

District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures): 23 (3.11%)

Other reasons such as school closure due to weather: 21 (2.84%)

Total Late: 739 (100%)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A date-based, auto-calculation spreadsheet was provided for LEAs that opted not to use the state-provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>). The spreadsheet tracked the number of parental consents for evaluation and the number of evaluations completed on time. If evaluations were completed late (based on 60-day timeline), the number of days late and the reasons and exceptions for lateness were also collected in the spreadsheet. For LEAs that opted to use the state-provided IEP platform, this information was generated within IEP Platform. Special education directors submitted the data by July 31st for the previous fiscal year. The data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year. The GaDOE reviewed the Child Find data of each LEA to ensure timely initial evaluations. Georgia has a 60-day requirement from receipt of consent to the completion of the evaluation. This is a compliance indicator with a target of 100% completed on time.

The GaDOE also conducted a verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. The verification process ensured timeline data submitted were accurate. LEAs randomly selected were required to submit, through the SE Applications Dashboard, supporting documentation for the aggregate data that was provided to the State. LEAs were required to submit the following information for students evaluated for special education eligibility in the July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023 data collection window: name, date of receipt of parental consent for evaluation, and date of completion of evaluation. After the submission, the State required the LEA to submit documents (i.e., parental consents, evaluations) on students selected from the LEA provided list to substantiate the reported information. LEAs that were not 100% compliant for completion of evaluations were not included in the verification analysis. These LEAs were not included because their information was already scrutinized in the correction of individual case and regulatory/systemic compliance. The verification process served to validate the data of those LEAs that indicated 100% compliance with their submission of initial timelines. LEAs in the verification process with discrepancies in their reported and reviewed evaluations were required to complete individual and regulatory/systemic compliance activities as described below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
57	57	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There were 57 LEAs identified as having noncompliance in implementing regulatory requirements. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. Correction activities for regulatory compliance required special education directors to submit current year

timeline data to demonstrate systemic (regulatory) compliance. Data regarding evaluations completed between July 1, 2022 through November 10, 2022 was required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. Based on the review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by noncompliant LEAs, GaDOE verified subsequent correction of noncompliance in 57 out of the 57 LEAs. These LEAs had subsequently corrected and were now implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance in alignment with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEAs not at 100% compliance had to complete individual case correction activities. The first step in the activities required special education directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the special education directors submitted a list of students' names for records reported as noncompliant and the date that the evaluation was completed. The deadline for this collection was September 22, 2022. This addressed the individual records reported as noncompliant. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each of the 652 individual records that exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	16	16	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The 16 noncompliant LEAs were brought into alignment through a multi-step process. The special education director was provided with the following secured email by the Results Driven Accountability unit of the DSESS:

Dear Director,

I am attaching the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form for you to complete as referenced in the Timelines Notification Letter sent out on November 27, 2022.

Please use the form to:

- Provide a narrative about the policies, procedures, and practices that were revised to support the correction of this noncompliance.
- Give a brief description of how Professional Learning will be provided to support correction of noncompliance.
- Return the completed form to me via portal email by December 15, 2022.

Resources for Technical Assistance can be found at the links below:

- <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY24/Timelines%20Definitions%20and%20Directions%206-2-23.pdf>
- <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Data-Presentations-Recordings-Documents.aspx>
- <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>
- <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>
- <https://login.community.gadoe.org/events/reporting-timelines-in-sp-ed-applications-2> (GADOE Community)

Through the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form, LEAs were able to document the completion professional learning activities directed at achieving compliance. For example, one LEA had all staff complete video modules on the timelines procedures in the LEA. Staff were then required to complete an assessment on the modules to demonstrate mastery. Another action was to shorten the time between receipt of the evaluation referral and completion. LEAs also made use of the on-line resources above in completing evaluations in a timely manner. The Georgia Results Driven Accountability Unit verified that noncompliant LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data through a State data system; and (2) corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each of the individual records that exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 16 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As Indicated in the SPP/APR FFY2022, all areas of noncompliance for FFY 2021 and FFY2020 were brought into compliance. For FFY 2021, there were 57 LEAs identified as having noncompliance in implementing regulatory requirements. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. For correction of regulatory noncompliance, special education directors were required to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations completed between July 1, 2022 through November 10, 2022 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. Based on the review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified in 41 of the 57 of the LEAs with noncompliance identified were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements with 100% compliance. There were 16 of the original LEAs with noncompliance based on data submission. These LEAs were required to submit additional evaluation data while receiving additional monitoring and support until they were in 100% regulatory compliance as required by OSEP QA 23-01. For individual areas of noncompliance special education directors provided a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to correct the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students' names reported as noncompliant and the date that the evaluation was completed. The deadline for this collection was September 22, 2022. This addressed the isolated findings of non-compliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each of the 652 individual records that exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-10.

The 16 LEAs from FFY 2020 with remaining noncompliance were brought into compliance through a multi-step process. The Special Education director was provided with the following secured email from the Results Driven Accountability unit from the DSESS:

Dear Director,

I am attaching the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form for you to complete as referenced in the Timelines Notification Letter sent out on November 27, 2022.

Please use the form to:

- Provide a narrative about the policies, procedures, and practices that were revised to support the correction of this noncompliance.
- Give a brief description of how Professional Learning will be provided to support correction of noncompliance.
- Return the completed form to me via portal email by December 15, 2022.

Resources for Technical Assistance can be found at the links below:

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY24/Timelines%20Definitions%20and%20Directions%206-2-23.pdf>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Data-Presentations-Recordings-Documents.aspx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://login.community.gadoe.org/events/reporting-timelines-in-sp-ed-applications-2> (GADOE Community)

<https://login.community.gadoe.org/events/reporting-timelines-in-sp-ed-applications-2> (GADOE Community)

Through the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form, LEAs were able to document the completion professional learning activities directed at achieving compliance. For example, one LEA had all staff complete video modules on the timelines procedures in the LEA. Staff were then required to complete an assessment on the modules to demonstrate mastery. Another action was to shorten the time between receipt of the evaluation referral and completion. LEAs also made use of the on-line resources above in completing evaluations in a timely manner. The Georgia Results Driven Accountability Unit verified that noncompliant LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data through a State data system; and (2) corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.98%	98.40%	98.40%	96.91%	98.10%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,777
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	614

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,215
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	863
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	53
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,215	3,247	98.10%	100%	99.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

32

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.

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

- 1 - 10 days: 11 students
- 11 - 30 days: 12 students
- 31 - 60 days: 5 students
- > 60 days: 4 students

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

- Student delay: 0 student (0 %)
- Parent delay: 10 students (31.25%)
- Teacher/evaluator delay: 18 students (56.25%)
- System errors: 2 students (6.25%)
- Other delay 1 student: (3.12%)
- Student referred to LEA by BCW less than 90 days before 3rd birthday: 1 student (3.12%)
- Total Late: 32 (100%)

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained 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 was provided for LEAs not participating in the state provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>) which tracked the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the third birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. For LEAs participating in the state provided IEP platform, the data was generated within the platform. Special education directors submitted the data on July 31, 2023 (for the July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023, window). The aggregated transition data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application located within the secured Special Education Applications Portal used to track this indicator year-to-year. Individual and regulatory activities were required for LEAs that were not at 100% compliance (see Correction of Findings of Noncompliance for more information on these processes).

The GaDOE also conducted a verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If an LEA was selected, the special education director uploaded child-specific data for children transitioning from Part C to Part B reported with completed evaluation, eligibility, and IEP from the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 150 evaluations/eligibilities/IEPs for young children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed, the director uploaded a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion dates, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 150 referrals were completed in a timely manner with an IEP in place by the child's third birthday. GaDOE staff check these data against what the school system reported in the Student Record data collection. The verification process checked the accuracy of the information submitted in SE Applications for Timelines. LEAs that were not 100% compliant for completion of evaluations and implementation of IEPs by the third birthday were not included in the verification analysis. These LEAs were not included because their information was already scrutinized in the correction of individual case and regulatory/systemic compliance. The verification process served to validate the data of those LEAs that indicated 100% compliance with their submission of initial timelines. LEAs in the verification process with discrepancies in their reported and reviewed evaluations information were required to complete individual and regulatory/systemic compliance activities as described below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There were 14 LEAs identified as having noncompliance in implementing regulatory requirements. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to correct the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. LEAs maintained a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. Special education directors had to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic/regulatory compliance. Current timelines data was used to determine regulatory compliance using evaluations, eligibilities, and IEPs completed between July 1, 2022 through November 10, 2022. All data was submitted through the Timelines application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation, eligibilities, and IEPs. Based on the review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified 100% compliance in 14 of the 14 LEAs with the additional data submitted. The state verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each of the 14 LEAs that exceeded the state timeline for children referred by Part C prior to age 3. Eligibility determinations were made for these children and, if eligible for Part B, IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

LEAs not at 100% compliance had to complete individual case activities for correction. Special education directors were required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the special education directors submitted the list of students' names reported as noncompliant, the dates of the evaluations, the dates eligibility determinations were made, and dates the IEPs were implemented. The deadline for this collection was September 22, 2023. This addressed the isolated findings of noncompliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, the dates of the evaluations, the dates eligibility determinations were made, and dates the IEPs were implemented through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each of the 59 individual records that exceeded the state timeline for children referred by Part C prior to age 3. Eligibility determinations were made for these children and, if eligible for Part B, IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	2	2	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The 2 noncompliant LEAs were brought into compliance through a multi-step process. The Special Education director was provided with the following secured email by the Results Driven Accountability unit of the DSESS:

Dear Director,

I am attaching the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form for you to complete as referenced in the Timelines Notification Letter sent out on November 27, 2022.

Please use the form to:

- Provide a narrative about the policies, procedures, and practices that were revised to support the correction of this noncompliance.
- Give a brief description of how Professional Learning will be provided to support correction of noncompliance.
- Return the completed form to me via portal email by December 15, 2022.

Resources for Technical Assistance can be found at the links below:

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY24/Timelines%20Definitions%20and%20Directions%206-2-23.pdf>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Data-Presentations-Recordings-Documents.aspx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://login.community.gadoe.org/events/reporting-timelines-in-sp-ed-applications-2> (GADOE Community)

Through the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form, LEAs were able to document the completion of professional learning activities directed at achieving compliance. For example, one LEA had all staff complete video modules on the timelines procedures in the LEA. Staff were then required to complete an assessment on the modules to demonstrate mastery. Another action was to shorten the time between receipt of the referral and evaluation completion. LEAs also made use of the on-line resources above in completing evaluations, eligibilities, and IEPs in a timely manner. The Georgia Results Driven Accountability Unit verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each LEA that exceeded the state timeline for children referred

by Part C prior to age 3. Eligibility determinations were made for these children and, if eligible for Part B, IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, dates that an evaluation and eligibility determination were made, and the date the IEP was in place through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each of the individual records that exceeded the state timeline for children referred by Part C prior to age 3. Eligibility determinations were made for these children and, if eligible for Part B, IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining two (2) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As indicated in the SPP/APR FFY2022, all areas of noncompliance for FFY 2021 and FFY2020 were brought into compliance. For FFY 2021 There were 2 LEAs identified as having noncompliance in implementing regulatory requirements. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. LEAs maintained a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. Regulatory implementation correction required Special education directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations, eligibility determinations made, and IEPs in place for children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed between July 1, 2022 through November 10, 2022 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation, eligibility determination, and IEP development and implementation. Based on the review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified in 12 of the 14 LEAs with noncompliance they were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements with 100% compliance. There were 2 of the original LEAs with noncompliance based upon the submission of the data. These LEAs were required to submit additional evaluation, eligibility, and IEP data while receiving additional monitoring and support until they were in 100% regulatory compliance as required by OSEP QA 23-01. For Individual areas of noncompliance, special education directors provided a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to correct the noncompliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the special education directors submitted the list of students' names reported as noncompliant and the date that the evaluation was completed, the date an eligibility determination was made, and the date the IEP was implemented. The deadline for this collection was September 22, 2022. This addressed the isolated findings of noncompliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, dates of the evaluations, dates that eligibility determinations were made, and dates IEPs were implemented through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each of the individual records that exceeded the state timeline for children referred by Part C prior to age 3. Eligibility determinations were made for these children and, if eligible for Part B, IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

For the 2 remaining FFY 2020 areas of noncompliance, the 2 noncompliant LEAs were brought into compliance through a multi-step process. The Special Education director was provided with the following secured email by the Results Driven Accountability unit:

Dear Director,

I am attaching the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form for you to complete as referenced in the Timelines Notification Letter sent out on November 27, 2022.

Please use the form to:

- Provide a narrative about the policies, procedures, and practices that were revised to support the correction of this noncompliance.
- Give a brief description of how Professional Learning will be provided to support correction of noncompliance.
- Return the completed form to me via portal email by December 15, 2022.

Resources for Technical Assistance can be found at the links below:

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY24/Timelines%20Definitions%20and%20Directions%206-2-23.pdf>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Data-Presentations-Recordings-Documents.aspx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>

<https://login.community.gadoe.org/events/reporting-timelines-in-sp-ed-applications-2> (GADOE Community)

Through the Timelines Narrative and Professional Learning Form, LEAs were able to document the completion of professional learning activities directed at achieving compliance. For example, one LEA had all staff complete video modules on the timelines procedures in the LEA. Staff were then required to complete an assessment on the modules to demonstrate mastery. Another action was to shorten the time between receipt of the evaluation referral and completion. LEAs also made use of the on-line resources above in completing evaluations, eligibilities, and IEPs in a timely manner. The Georgia Results Driven Accountability Unit verified the correction of findings of noncompliance for each of the individual records that exceeded the state timeline for children referred by Part C prior to age 3. These children were found eligible for Part B and IEPs were developed and implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 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 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. In its description of the verification of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced the incorrect requirements of this indicator. For noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, the State indicated, "LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation." For noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, the State indicated "GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs)."

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	94.25%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.25%	91.36%	91.10%	91.67%	93.54%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
223	267	93.54%	100%	83.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Georgia teacher retention data for special education teachers (<https://georgiainsights.gadoe.org/Dashboards/Pages/EducatorPipeline-Teachers.aspx>) indicated retention levels that were adversely impacting the stability of writing effective, legally compliant transition plans. Teacher retention for special education teachers in 2023 was 89.81% which represents a decrease of 1.8 percentage points from 2022. The 2023 retention rate of special education teachers in charter schools was 84.54%, which was 5.23 percentage points below the state average. The 2023 retention rate for Metro LEAs is 88.35, which was 1.46 percentage points below the state average. Within the Metro LEAs group, serving large numbers of special education students, individual LEA retention rates were lower (i.e., Atlanta Public Schools (80.79%), Fulton County (85.02%). Other Georgia LEAs, serving large numbers of students, also had retention rates that were lower than the state average (i.e., Richmond County (86.58), Muscogee County (85.22%). A by-product of special education teacher attrition was an increased number of new special education teachers many of whom are earning their teaching credential through alternative preparation programs. These teachers enter the field with a lack of preparation in writing effective, legally compliant transition plans. Georgia is actively working toward resolving the issue of teacher retention with the nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support for LEAs in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families.

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

State monitoring

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

For FFY22, the GaDOE reviewed the transition plans of students aged 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review. The GADOE reviewed the transition plans of systems in the 2022-2023 school year Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) Cycle. The review consisted of an evaluation of a selection of each participating CFM system’s transition plans. The number of plans reviewed was based on the reviewed system’s size, with at least 5 transition plans reviewed during the CFM process. Some small LEAs did not have 5 students aged 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review and each student meeting those criteria was included.

GaDOE also reviewed the transition plans of any LEA that participated as part of an optional additional review for their Annual Performance Report (APR) and LEA Determination for Indicator 13. When LEAs were in the CFM process and transition plans were evaluated, a percentage of compliance was determined based upon the initial selection of plans reviewed and subsequently corrected plans were not considered in the percentage. For example, if an LEA had 10 plans reviewed and 6 were compliant the percentage is 60% on the LEAs determination. The LEA was required to correct the noncompliant plans to bring them into 100% compliance. However, the LEA remained at 60% compliance in their determination. That percentage remained in the LEA’s determination until the LEA was monitored again or elected to participate in an opt in review of transition plans. In a subsequent year, the LEA can request the selection of additional plans for review by GaDOE and receive an updated percentage of compliance based upon the later review. The updated review compliance percentage can then be used in the LEAs determination rather than the prior review’s percentage.

The transition plans were reviewed by GaDOE DSESS in the Results Driven Accountability Unit for compliance with the following transition plan indicators: postsecondary outcome goal for employment, postsecondary outcome goal for education/training, postsecondary outcome goal for independent living (if appropriate), annual transition goals that reflect steps to desired post-secondary outcome goals, postsecondary goals based upon transition assessments, transition services and/or activities to facilitate movement to postsecondary outcomes, course of study to facilitate movement to post-school outcomes, student invited to the meeting, agency representative invited (if applicable) and parental consent received prior to inviting agency representative (if applicable). For transition plans to be determined 100% compliant, each indicator in the reviewed criteria had to be met. If there were questions about any transition indicator containing the necessary elements, a second reviewer at GaDOE validated or refuted the decision. All DSESS reviewers participated in a training session for reviewing transition components prior to evaluating any transition plans. The training provided clear descriptions and examples of acceptable plan components to ensure consistency of the evaluation of plans.

An LEA was determined compliant only if all transition plan indicators on all reviewed plans were compliant. For LEAs that had transition plans found to be noncompliant, individual case and regulatory activities were required (see Correction of Findings of Noncompliance for more information on these processes). LEAs with noncompliance were required to submit additional plans to address systemic compliance. LEAs with continued noncompliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required components for secondary transition. LEAs were also provided with targeted TA on writing compliant Transition Plans.

The GaDOE calculated the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above containing each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans in the original submission. The GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data collected through the Special Education Applications Portal.

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

If no, please explain

GaDOE requires that IEPs include Transition Services beginning not later than the student’s entry into ninth grade or by age 16, whichever comes first, or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP Team. The students selected for state monitoring will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DSESS at GaDOE recognizes the importance of effective transition planning for students with disabilities in attaining desirable post-school outcomes. The Special Education Director serves on the State Rehabilitation Council by appointment of the Governor. She has served as a member since 2016 representing the Georgia Department of Education. Prior to the pandemic, she chaired the Comprehensive State Needs Assessment (CSNA) committee. The State Rehabilitation Council is in the middle of a collection of stakeholder feedback for the current CSNA now. DSESS collaborates on a regular basis with a Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (GVRA) representative serving as a speaker on the monthly special education director’s webinar. Additionally, GVRA regional personnel attend the monthly regional special education director’s meetings.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
23	23	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For LEAs that had transition plans found to be noncompliant, Individual case and regulatory compliance activities were required. The State addressed the implementation of regulatory requirements (systemic compliance) by requiring the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required regulatory components for secondary transition. School systems had to demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. Targeted technical assistance was provided by the DSESS to noncompliant LEAs to help meet regulatory requirements. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 made any necessary changes and were now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

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

Individual case noncompliance required the correction of individual noncompliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Each LEA with noncompliance identified achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data (i.e., a revised transition plan) subsequently collected through the State secured data system (Special Education Applications). The state verified that for each student determined to have noncompliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance. Numerous technical assistance and professional development opportunities were provided to the noncompliant systems on revising individual noncompliant plans such as a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As indicated in the SPP/APR for FFY 2022, LEAs that had transition plans found to be noncompliant, individual and regulatory/systemic compliance activities were required. Regulatory compliance correction required the submission of additional transition plans for review. LEAs with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required regulatory components for secondary transition. School systems had to demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 made any necessary changes and were now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Individual noncompliant transition plan(s) were reviewed and revised for 100% compliance. Policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning were also revised if it was determined they were leading to individual or regulatory noncompliance. Each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2021 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data (i.e., a revised transition plan) subsequently collected through the State secured data system (Special Education Applications). The state verified that for each student determined to have noncompliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance. Numerous technical assistance and professional development opportunities were provided to the noncompliant systems on revising individual noncompliant plans such as a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target >=	27.00%	27.40%	27.40%	27.40%	27.40%
A	27.23%	Data	25.95%	24.44%	25.62%	26.86%	27.00%
B	2009	Target >=	53.90%	54.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
B	51.46%	Data	59.76%	58.40%	57.78%	60.34%	61.67%
C	2009	Target >=	80.10%	80.10%	80.10%	81.00%	82.00%
C	77.08%	Data	82.92%	84.77%	83.98%	84.23%	84.08%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.80%	27.80%	27.80%	27.90%
Target B >=	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C >=	82.00%	83.00%	83.00%	84.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	16,490
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	13,326
Response Rate	80.81%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	3,567
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	4,646
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)	1,046
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).	2,133

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	3,567	13,326	27.00%	27.80%	26.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	8,213	13,326	61.67%	57.00%	61.63%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	11,392	13,326	84.08%	82.00%	85.49%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	83.22%	80.81%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for any subgroup. Georgia also used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the gender representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for any subgroup with a total of 30 students or more. Georgia also used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the gender representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year.

Response rates are reported based upon a total of 13,326 respondents for the survey in FFY2022 based upon 16,490 total students who exited school in 2021-2022. The response rate for the entire group was 80.81% which was used to compare the + or – 5 percentage points range for representativeness for each ethnic/racial subgroups. Ethnic/racial groups response rates are reported as follows: African American 5,614 respondents (79.13%) of 7,095 exiters (-1.68 percentage points from 80.81%) , Hispanic 1,956 respondents (79.42%) of 2,463 exiters (-1.39 percentage points from 80.81%), Other 236 respondents (78.93%) of 299 exiters (-1.88 percentage points from 80.81%), More than One Race 445 respondents (80.04%) of 556 exiters (-0.77 percentage points from 80.81%), and White 5,075 respondents (83.51%) of 6,077 exiters (2.70 percentage points from 80.81%).

The gender analysis for response rate using the same procedure described above yielded no significant differences in either response or nonresponse. The response rate for the entire group was 80.81%, which was the target for the comparison. Of the 13,343 exiters, 4,656 were female and 83.67% responded to the survey (2.68 percentage points from 80.81%). There were 8,687 male exiters and 82.97% responded to the survey (2.16 percentage points from 80.81%). Nonresponse rates were 16.23% for female and 17.02% for male. There was a 1.6 percentage point difference between the response and nonresponse rates on the gender analysis.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

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

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The effective strategies provided by GaDOE to LEAs include the following:

- 1) encouraging LEAs to have IEP case managers and/or transition specialists of exiting students collect extensive contact information to use the next year to enable contact and a follow-up on student outcomes and progress
- 2) encouraging LEAs to reach out to students using social media, such as Facebook
- 3) posting the exiters from the prior school year in February of the current school year for each LEA in Special Education Applications to enable LEAs to start reaching out to students in a timely manner
- 4) encouraging LEAs to review the listing of exiters by the student's Georgia's unique Testing Identifier (GTID) in the Georgia GUIDE system to be certain exiting students have not reenrolled in either their LEA or another LEA prior to census submission
- 5) encouraging LEAs to use bilingual resources and interpreters to contact students who are English Learners
- 6) LEAs work with vocational rehabilitation counselors who assist in locating exiters
- 7) providing LEAs with data regarding outcomes for exiters disaggregated by region of the state, LEA size groups, LEAs meeting on not meeting targets on this indicator which is designed to increase representativeness
- 8) soliciting feedback from the State Advisory Panel on increasing response rate

GaDOE provides extensive support to LEAs directed at encouraging response rate increase through presentations and email reminders via Email Blasts. GaDOE also provides modules and guidance to LEAs on a transition website see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Transition-Compliance.aspx>

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation and gender of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for response. The total group of exiters was 16,490 with 13,326 respondents to the Post-School Survey for an 80.81% overall participation rate.

Response analysis and nonresponse bias analysis examined response and nonresponse on the survey at the unit level (i.e., participation v. nonparticipation), not the item level. For response rate, the percentage of total survey respondents in a specific ethnic/racial group in the survey was compared to the total percentage of students who exited at the conclusion of the prior school year in the same ethnic/racial group. For example, there were 5,614 African American respondents from the total of 7,095 African American exiters yielding a participation percentage of 79.13%. Due to the small number of students surveyed in the American Indian (n=47), Pacific Islander (n=12) and Asian (n=240) subgroups these subgroups were combined into an Other (n=299) subgroup for analysis. The relative response rates and relative exiter rates for all ethnic and racial groups were within the +/-5 percentage points threshold. As a result, the entirety of the subgroup analysis was determined to be representative.

An analysis of the Unengaged Outcome was conducted to be sure that there was no significant difference between the groups in this area. It is critical to Georgia that students with disabilities have engagement in post-school activities after exiting high school. Fortunately, all Unengaged racial and ethnic groups were within the +/- 5 percentage points threshold.

Black (13.38%), Hispanic (12.32%), More than one race (17.75%), White (12.67%), Other (9.75%) and Total (13.03%). Given the acceptably even response rates and the Unengaged Outcome rates by each gender, nonresponse bias in terms of race/ethnicity does not seem to be an issue.

An analysis of the Unengaged Outcome by gender yielded a negligible difference that was well within the +/- 5 percentage points threshold (male (12.95%) and female (13.19%). Given the acceptably even response rates and the Unengaged Outcome rates by each gender, nonresponse bias in terms of gender does not seem to be an issue.

Even though there was no response bias, Georgia implemented numerous strategies including the following steps to reduce the possibility nonresponse bias:

- 1) posting the exiters from the prior school year in February of the current school year for each LEA in Special Education Applications to enable LEAs to start reaching out to students in a timely manner
- 2) encouraging LEAs to review the listing of exiters by the student's Georgia's Unique Testing Identifier (GTID) in the Georgia GUIDE system to be certain exiting students have not reenrolled in either their LEA or another LEA prior to census submission
- 3) encouraging LEAs to use bilingual resources and interpreters to contact students who are English Learners
- 4) LEAs work with vocational rehabilitation counselors who assist in locating exiters
- 5) providing LEAs with data regarding outcomes for exiters disaggregated by region of the state, LEA size groups, LEAs meeting on not meeting targets on this indicator which is designed to increase representativeness

Georgia also provides technical assistance by conducting the Statewide Transition Consortia. There is also a Transition Collaborative with representation from across the state to implement the State Transition Strategic Plan. Finally, improving post-school outcomes is addressed through data digs, program evaluation, and specialized research-based and evidence-based initiatives.

- Statewide Transition Consortia: The statewide transition consortium meets monthly to share state priorities, new information and initiatives pertaining to multiple aspects of transition. Outside presenters from state agencies who will pay for or support a student with disabilities in their postsecondary environment are invited to share information and answer questions.

- Transition Collaborative: The transition collaborative includes representation from across the state to create and implement the State Strategic Plan. Member ship includes representation from institutions of higher education, outside agencies, including GVRA, regional Georgia Learning Resource Systems, district transition specialists, assistive technology, GaDOE CTAE/CTI, GaDOE Counseling and Dual Enrollment, GaDOE special education members, and parents of students with disabilities. The State Strategic plan outlines goals for technical assistance and training based on a statewide needs assessment taken by transition specialists, and evidence-based and best-practices to improve transition postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. Members of this team participate in the National Technical Assistance Center: The Collaborative Capacity Building Institute annually.
- District specific TA on Improving Postschool Outcomes through data digs, program evaluation, and specialized research-based and evidence-based initiatives (4 Part workshop): The state has been offering targeted technical assistance to districts on a voluntary basis to review data to evaluate transition processes and programs. This is a 4-part training that includes a deep dive into data attached to specific students to determine if transition programming and plans were appropriate to ensure the student's movement towards their postsecondary goal. This workshop includes the development of a multi-disciplinary team which includes interagency and interagency members and the development of an improvement plan for the district.
- GVRA Partnership to implement Pre-ETS: The GaDOE collaborates with GVRA to support district teams, which include VR transition personnel, to implement the Pathful Explore platform for pre-employment transition services. This includes 4 trainings on the use of the platform to build capacity within the district in the use of the platform and individualized technical assistance, as needed.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The DSESS at GaDOE recognizes the importance of effective transition planning for students with disabilities in attaining desirable post-school outcomes. The Special Education Director serves on the State Rehabilitation Council by appointment of the Governor. She has served as a member since 2016 representing the Georgia Department of Education. Prior to the pandemic, she chaired the Comprehensive State Needs Assessment (CSNA) committee. The State Rehabilitation Council is in the middle of a collection of stakeholder feedback for the current CSNA now. DSESS collaborates on a regular basis with a Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (GVRA) representative serving as a speaker on the monthly special education director's webinar. Additionally, GVRA regional personnel attend the monthly regional special education director's meetings.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	92
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	19

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	60.98%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	63.00%	63.10%	63.10%	50.00%-70.00%	50.00%-70.00%
Data	45.83%	60.98%	43.24%	13.04%	25.42%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
19	92	25.42%	50.00%	70.00%	20.65%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The number of resolution sessions in the current reporting year (n=92) has increased from the previous year (n=59) which has continued the increasing trend after the pandemic. The number of resolution sessions that were resolved in the current period through settlement agreements (n=19) improved

from the prior reporting period (n=15). The increase of 35.9% in overall resolutions was significantly higher than the increase of 21.1% in the rate of successful resolution sessions leading to slippage.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the resolution and mediation processes and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation.aspx>). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents and LEAs with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support to parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of filing for a due process hearing and needing a Resolution Session.

GaDOE has hired additional personnel in the Dispute Resolution and Outreach unit to provide more proactive support to parents and LEAs. Georgia also hired an Ombudsman to provide additional support to the LEAs and families with neutrality. The Ombudsman serves as a designated neutral party who advocates for a fair process and provides confidential, informal assistance and support to parents, guardians, advocates, educators, and students with disabilities.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	90
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	32

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center

- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00%-70.00%	50.00%-70.00%	50.00%-70.00%
Data	63.11%	61.54%	65.88%	41.30%	47.87%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8	32	90	47.87%	50.00%	70.00%	44.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage is due to a decrease of 4 in the number of mediations conducted with 5 fewer mediations that resulted in mediation agreements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the resolution and mediation processes and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation.aspx>). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents and LEAs with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support to parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of needing mediation.

GaDOE has increased support in the Dispute Resolution and Outreach unit to provide more proactive support to LEAs. Georgia utilizes an Ombudsman to provide additional support to the LEAs and families with neutrality. The Ombudsman serves as a designated neutral party who advocates for a fair process and provides confidential, informal assistance and support to parents, guardians, advocates, educators, and students with disabilities.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The SiMR for FFY2022 is to increase graduation rates for students with disabilities in 50 selected LEAs.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subgroup of nine LEAs is part of the original 50 LEAs identified in the SSIP process and documented in the 2016 SSIP. The subgroup of LEAs was identified due to low graduation rates for students with disabilities and/or closing the gap and content mastery. These criteria are applied annually to LEAs within the 50 selected LEAs to determine the subset of LEAs to target for intensive support and intervention. The GaDOE School Improvement Division and the Division of Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) worked collaboratively to identify the 9 LEAs based upon the parameters of Georgia's ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) Plan. The ESSA plan (<https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/communications/Documents/Georgia%20State%20ESSA%20Plan%20Submission%20--%20Amended%206.20.19.pdf>) identifies the specific criteria based used to identify the LEAs with schools that met the following criteria: Criteria #1 Consistently Underperforming Subgroup (All Schools) - have at least one subgroup that is performing in the lowest 5% of all schools in at least 50% of College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) components. Criteria #2 Among all schools identified for consistently underperforming subgroup, have at least one subgroup that is performing in the lowest 5% of all school in all CCRPI components. The CCRPI is a comprehensive school improvement, accountability, and communication platform for all educational stakeholders that promotes college and career readiness for all Georgia public school students. Additional information regarding the CCRPI can be located at (<https://www.gadoe.org/CCRPI/Pages/default.aspx>). The LEAs that received intensive support were Targeted Support Improvement (TSI) Districts/Schools/SSIP Districts (Atlanta Public Schools, Bibb, Bulloch, Clayton, Savannah-Chatham, DeKalb, Fulton, Muscogee, and Richmond) as defined above. Specific schools in each LEA received targeted support and included : (Richmond County – Bayvale Elementary, Belair K-8, Diamond Lakes, Monte Sano, Lamar-Milledge, Josey High School, Glenn Hills High School, Cross Creek High School, Hephzibah High School, and Laney High School),(Bulloch County – Langston Chapel Elementary, Statesboro High, Southeast Bulloch High and Langston Chapel Middle Schools),(Savannah-Chatham County – Largo-Tibet Elementary, Groves High, Beach High, Jenkins High, the School of Liberal Studies at Savannah High and Windsor Forest Elementary Schools), (Atlanta Public Schools – Toomer Elementary, Deerwood Academy, Centennial Academy, Kipp Soul Academy, Kindezi West, Kindezi Old Fourth Ward, Douglass High, Booker T. Washington, and STEAM Academy at Carver Schools), (Muscogee County – Lonnie Jackson Academy, Georgetown Elementary, Carver High and Dimon Elementary Schools), (Clayton County - Jackson Elementary, Kilpatrick Elementary, and Charles R. Drew High, Mundy's Mill High and Morrow High School), (Bibb County – Bibb VIP Academy, Southwest High, Westside High, Northeast High, and Howard High Schools), (DeKalb County – McNair High, Towers High, Pine Ridge Elementary, Salem Elementary, Shadow Rock Elementary, Woodridge Elementary, MLK High, Stephenson High, Clarkston High, Chamblee Charter High, Columbia High, and Stone Mountain High Schools), (Fulton County – Bear Creek Middle, Hamilton E. Holmes Elementary, and Nolan Elementary School).

Although intensive targeted support is provided only to the targeted schools listed above within the nine LEAs, data for graduation is collected for all of the 50 selected LEAs indicated in the SiMR because support is provided to these LEAs. The collection of data for the 50 LEAs allows the DSESS to determine if the entire group LEAs identified in the SiMR is making progress. The State SSIP provides universal support for all LEAs, including the original 50 LEAs, through its PL (Professional Learning) series, School Administrator Academy (SESAA), and monthly collaborative communities. SESAA included a series of PL webinars, individual and small group coaching, and access to special education focused, mixed reality activities in the University of West Georgia's "UWGLive" Avatar Lab.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/p-59584e83/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3Ap%3A%2Fs%2FSSIPTeam%2FEZmoif6UHjtFsXOLufwI8EYB9gzEzseYWnw0tGhiryHAatg%3Fe%3DtC1c91&data=04%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7Cc6bd38ac9dba4e69881708d9e26e6a9d%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C637789786144944534%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAilCJljojV2luMzIlLCJBTi6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=k2ffDU2P3eLEGeUCwu59H7HJsPDtGfIN6n0yJg02lx4%3D&reserved=0>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	66.84%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	66.84%	67.84%	68.84%	68.84%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school with a regular diploma	Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school by graduating with a regular diploma, dropping out, or receiving a certificate	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,098	7,362	66.84%	66.84%	69.25%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

618 exiting data of the IDEA EDfacts file FS009 was used to calculate the annual event graduation rate. The data were analyzed through calculating the Annual Event Graduation rate as described in the FS009 specifications. Specifically, the number of students with disabilities for the 50 identified LEAs, including the subset of 9 targeted LEAs, who graduated with a regular diploma is divided by the number of students with disabilities who exited special education (not including students who moved known continuing, returned to regular education, or died).

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

LEAs collected graduation data and reported it to the state through their chosen student information system. The graduation data were reported to the state as a part of the Student Record data collection completed each year in mid June. Student Record provides a year-end, cumulative record of student program participation and various activities for the fiscal year. Data were collected from February through mid June. Student Record data was subject to numerous audits for accuracy enabling both LEAs and the state to verify the accuracy of the data submitted. The lengthy window for data submission allowed LEAs to examine the data thoroughly prior to final submission. Numerous resources were available to LEAs for data examination (see <https://georgiainsights.gadoe.org/Data-Collections/Pages/Student-Record-Resources.aspx>). For example, the Student Record Data Element Detail document describes the specific diploma types and withdrawal reason. Inside the secured Data Collection application in the GaDOE portal, there are numerous secured reports such as Graduate Diploma Information. The report indicates the total number of graduates and the diploma type (Certificate of Performance, Special Education Diploma, General High School Diploma) reported for the school system. The reports as well as others (e.g., Withdrawal Reason Report, Dropouts who are Active in Another System) enabled LEAs to carefully review the specific students being submitted as graduates, type of diploma, and dropouts to ensure accuracy in data reporting. The state also provided a School Completion Toolkit that guided the 50 LEAs through a deep analysis of data and provided evidence-based tools and resources to support data analysis and interventions. The Toolkit was also publicly available for all LEAs at (<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>).

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The State collects the following measures of success: District Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence, Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric, Benchmark data on EBPs, District Annual Survey, State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey, professional learning evaluation survey, District Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data, state assessment data on academic proficiency, annual event graduation rates, district benchmark data and anecdotal data from continuous improvement team meetings.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/w-59584e83/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3A%3A%2F%2FSSIPTeam%2FEeUq0AHQOodKtkAycG8jaqsBl3XtNzQFFnQSR26qLrn3Yg%3Fe%3D9CTuzJ&data=04%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C4c9f3c94ceec49705f3508d9db50d929%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C637781962565162975%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAILCJQljiV2luMzliLJBtIi6k1haWwiLcJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Huz%2FTNQD2lXZw2mthYcxSIBd6mvWKPakuyKrfGywyk%3D&reserved=0>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: Provide high quality professional learning to leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit facilitated the SSIP Professional Learning Series conducted virtually through webinars, which included the following topics tailored to meet the needs of LEAs based on surveys from the previous year: Integrating Mathematics Content for Secondary Students with Disabilities, Integrating Social Studies Content for Secondary SWDs, Integrating Science content for Secondary SWD, High Leverage Practices (HLP) #7 & #16 Establishing a Supportive Learning Environment Utilizing Explicit Instructional Strategies, HLP #14 Utilizing Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies to Support Memory, Attention and Self-Regulation, and Teaching ESOL and SWD Dually Identified Students in Secondary Settings. Other stakeholder requested training opportunities provided virtually included 19 Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) trainings, 9 Behavior trainings, monthly Teacher/Provider Retention Program (TPRP) sessions, and 18 trainings on AT and Accessible Materials. We continued the Special Education and School Administrator Academy (SESAA) to deliver a series of professional learning opportunities that make up a "Special Education 101" type series, comprised of 18 professional learning webinars, aimed at improving the special education knowledge base of school and LEA administrators. 3,937 total participants attended SSIP related professional learning: 217 attended the SSIP Professional Learning Series. 1,974 attended SESAA trainings; 783 attended SDI trainings; 536 attended behavior training; and 427 attended TPRP HLP sessions. Staff from the Georgia Learning and Resource System (GLRS) provided 160 requested specialized trainings to the identified SSIP districts. Survey data gathered from the SESAA and SSIP professional learning attendees indicated that 96% considered the training useful, 88% said it was high quality, and 93% indicated it was relevant. 70% of participating SSIP LEAs indicated the training was of high quality, relevant, and useful to the SSIP work. 70% of LEA's indicated improvement in knowledge and skills on topics. There were 1,148 participants in attendance in TPRP sessions conducted. Survey data gathered in these monthly sessions indicated 90% of attendees or higher agree or strongly agree rating regarding high quality, relevance, useful for teaching Georgia students, gaining new knowledge, and overall satisfaction with the training, and feeling ready to use the training.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: Develop and disseminate print and digital resources to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Digital Tools and Resources Resource Guides: The School Completion Toolkit, websites for HLPs and Inclusive Leadership, guides for Distance Learning, Collaborative Planning, School Leadership Team, and Teacher Tools Newsletters and Family Engagement One Pagers were created or expanded. These resource guides, listed above, were developed, and disseminated to all LEAs in Georgia. On average, there were 4,100 page views of the School Completion Toolkit with "Select Interventions" being the most visited. LEAs reported the digital and print resources were useful, relevant, and improved knowledge and skills around graduation, student achievement and the SSIP work. The targeted LEAs were also provided with data collection tools including templates to collect data on interventions such as Check and Connect, Early Warning System, and the reading intervention. Digital resources were delivered via email and web platforms. Paper resources were delivered via mail or by personnel from the Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit of the DSESS.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: Provide technical assistance including coaching to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Technical Assistance and Coaching: 277 collective support technical assistance and coaching meetings were held to support LEAs. 57% (157/277sessions) of all technical assistance and coaching was completed with LEA effectiveness partners. Coaching and technical assistance were provided in collaboration with SSIP and school improvement program specialists. According to the Annual LEA Survey, 100% of selected LEAs reported collective support between School and LEA Improvement (SDI) and DSESS were highly effective and provided high-quality relevant supports and resources. In previous surveys, 100% of stakeholders agree collaboration should continue. It should be noted that delays in release of the list of identified schools, having memorandums of agreement in place, and major changes in GaDOE personnel resulted in less time to engage and support districts. 65% of selected LEAs/schools reported the SSIP program specialists were effective and provided high-quality professional learning. 60% of selected LEAs/schools reported the SSIP program specialists provided technical assistance and coaching that changed practices for student success. Areas of need noted on the Annual LEA Survey included assistance selecting evidence-based programs and curriculum, supports with teacher observation walks, professional learning on how effective instruction should look (HLP's), data analysis, dropout prevention, behavioral supports, and scheduling assistance to allow time for interventions.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The SSIP Evaluation Plan informed all evaluation activities and adjustments to implementation, including decisions regarding continued implementation of improvement strategies. Strategies and frameworks were evidence-based and have proven to build a sustainable system. Data sources included quantitative data (attendance and academic proficiency) collected by the GaDOE, data collection tools developed by OSEP-funded TA centers (i.e., What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA), and customized tools including surveys, checklists, rubrics, and pre/post-tests. These tools support the systems framework to promote accountability/monitoring and provide relevant professional development and technical assistance.

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: pre/post-tests, participant surveys, Annual LEA Survey and attendance records were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes. Data was collected to promote accountability and monitoring and address professional learning.

Short-Term Goals: Improve practitioner (LEA and school) knowledge of data-based decision making and selection and use of evidence-based practices. 85% of selected LEAs rated collaboration among SSIP team members as high or very high. 75% rated their engagement in implementing SSIP activities as high or very high. 70% participating in SSIP webinars rated them as being of high quality, relevant, and useful. 85% of participants in SSIP webinars agreed that they increased their knowledge of strategies to support implementation of evidence-based strategies. 65% of selected LEAs who received

technical assistance, coaching, or supports agreed the program specialist's support in these areas was of high quality, relevant, and useful. 60% agreed their assigned program specialist provided technical assistance, coaching, and/or supports that improved the LEA's ability to implement evidence-based practices.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: LEA Annual Survey and the Resource Development Log were used. LEA surveys and stakeholder feedback indicated a need for more digital resources and tools for LEAs. 100% of resources were completed in a timely manner.

Short Term Goals: 55% of selected LEAs agreed that SSIP print and digital resources increased their knowledge of strategies to support the implementation of evidence-based practices related to improving effective instruction.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: resource development logs, LEA Annual Survey, PL event documents, LEA Plan of Supports, Regional TA (Technical Assistance) surveys, and coaching logs were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes. Staff of targeted LEAs are pleased with the professional learning, technical assistance, and the resources, but they have clearly expressed a need for continued support to build sustainability and continue to focus on increasing graduation rates and student achievement.

Improve LEA and school infrastructure to support educators in implementing evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning.

Short Term Goals: 100% of selected LEA Plan of Supports included specific strategies for addressing improvement in graduation rates and achievement for Students with Disabilities (SWD)

- 92% of selected LEAs scored "Operational" or "Exemplary" on the Student Success LEA Team Fidelity Rubric scoring higher than target.
- 85% of LEA personnel reported engagement with other departments and regional technical assistance providers at collaborative/transformational levels.

Mid-Term Goals: EBP RUBRIC

Improve fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning for all students.

- 100% of the selected LEAs who chose to utilize an EBP had a moderate/strong level of implementation evidence. This met the target goal.
- 83% of selected schools were implementing EBPs at the full implementation level based upon LEA Plan of Supports Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly LEA meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the LEA. This exceeded the target 68%.
- 66% of selected schools were implementing EBPs with fidelity as measured by the GaDOE Implementation Fidelity Checklist for Evidence-Based Practices. The State met the target goal of 60%.

Mid-Term Goals: The Georgia Systems of Continuous Improvement framework (see <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Pages/Georgia%E2%80%99s-Systems-of-Continuous-Improvement.aspx>) was used to create a common problem-solving process that

used across all LEAs to identify improvement strategies and practices. Georgia's Systems of Continuous Improvement includes five steps: identify needs, select interventions, plan implementation, implement plan, and examine progress. Strategies and practices identified through the problem-solving process were documented in the District Improvement Plans or District Plans of Support. Schools also used the framework to identify improvement strategies and practices that were included in School Improvement Plans. Implementation of the problem-solving process with fidelity is critical to achieving the desired effects, because the implementation of the process itself leads to the selection and implementation of specific evidence-based practices. Intensive professional learning and follow-up technical assistance was provided by the GaDOE to support LEAs in utilizing this framework. Improve academic proficiency of students with disabilities in selected LEAs scoring proficient or above on state assessments.

KEY MEASURE: The percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. The target is 42% of SWD scoring at or above proficient for ELA and Math.

- The Percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs in grades 3 through 8 and high school selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System on the End of Grade (EOG) or End of Course (EOC) tests for 2022-2023 was 15.64% for ELA, a dramatic improvement of 9.92 percentage points from the prior year's percent of 5.72% for ELA. The percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System on the End of Grade (EOG) or End of Course (EOC) tests for 2022-2023 was 14.59% for Math, a dramatic improvement of 9.11 percentage points from the prior year's percent of 5.48% for Math. The percentage of all students in the targeted LEAs scoring proficient or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System on the EOG or EOC was 33.94% for ELA and 28.64% for Math.

KEY MEASURE: Percentage of students with disabilities in target schools within target LEAs in grades 3 through 8 and high school scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. The target is 35% of SWD scoring proficient or above within targeted schools in both ELA and Math.

- Percentage of students with disabilities in target schools within target LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or higher on Georgia End of Course or End of Grade for 2022-2023 was 8.07% for ELA and 6.65% for Math. These scores were an improvement from the 2021-2022 school year proficiency rates with 3.25% for ELA and 3.60% for Math reported.

KEY MEASURE: Percentage of selected LEAs decreasing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and the All-Students Group. The target is that 62% of the selected LEAs will decrease the gap.

- State assessment gaps were determined by evaluating the difference between the gaps for 2022 and 2023 results on the Georgia Milestones Assessment for LEAs at the 4th, 8th, and high school levels in ELA and Math. The percentage of LEAs reducing the gap in ELA were reported as: 44.4% grade 4, 55.5% grade 8, and 88.9% high school. LEAs reducing the gap in Math were reported as: 11.1% grade 4, 11.1% grade 8, and 11.1% high school.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: Provide high quality professional learning to leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

The State will continue its SSIP PL series for teachers and administrators. The State is contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey and Americans Institute of Research (AIR) to expand training and resources for Specially Designed Instruction to support Student Success. The anticipated outcome is that Specially Designed Instruction including targeted reading and attendance/grades/behavior interventions are implemented with greater fidelity resulting in improved student outcomes. Specific targets for Strategy One are available in the Evaluation Plan.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: Develop and disseminate print and digital resources to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Based on data analysis, survey and stakeholder engagement, the State is building a statewide Early Warning System Dashboard for all LEAs to identify at-risk students who need interventions. The anticipated outcome is that targeted LEAs will have the necessary resources to fully implement the Early Warning System and Check and Connect.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: Provide technical assistance including coaching to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

The Special Education and School Administrator Academy will work with LEAs by providing targeted professional learning and follow up sessions for additional support. Check and Connect and the Early Warning System data collection within targeted LEAs will be refined for more frequent feedback from the GaDOE SSIP team. The anticipated outcome is that targeted LEAs will review progress monitoring information on interventions in a timelier manner and make adaptations as warranted. It is anticipated that enhanced progress monitoring will enable the GaDOE SSIP team to work more collaboratively with targeted LEAs in supporting ways to meet students' needs.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

GaDOE provided guidance and training on selecting EBPs to all LEAs and tailored presentations were presented to the 9 selected LEAs. The EBPs the LEAs and schools chose were reviewed by GaDOE to ensure they met ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) and GaDOE level of evidence requirements. For this reporting period the following evidence-based practices were implemented: Check and Connect, Early Warning System, Lexia Core 5, SRA, Ascend Math, Lexia Power Up, Fast ForWord, iExcel, iReady .

The Check and Connect Mentoring Framework was implemented in four LEAs, Savannah- Chatham, Atlanta Public Schools, Clayton, Dekalb County, with an average of 100 students participating (this average includes the transition of students moving in and out of the LEA). The Early Warning System, an at-risk indicator and intervention framework, was implemented in Clayton County with consistent monitoring of over 75 students. Five LEAs (Atlanta Public Schools, Bibb County, Bulloch County, Dekalb County, and Richmond County) impacted over 500 students through the implementation of reading interventions. The interventions utilized were Lexia Core 5, Lexia Power Up, Read180, iReady, iExcel, SRA's Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Two of the evidence-based practices, the Check and Connect Mentoring Framework developed by the University of Minnesota and the Early Warning System validated by the American Institute for Research, are designed to improve graduation rates by monitoring indicators such as attendance, course completion, and discipline infractions. In each of these practices, teachers, counselors, and administrators at schools are assigned specific students to monitor the indicators for graduation. Specific adults in the schools are assigned as mentors to students at risk of dropping out and develop a relationship with the students and families through the Check and Connect Framework. The Early Warning System utilizes a team of professionals at the school level to monitor indicators such as attendance and behavior to provide support to at-risk students. Research has indicated that students are less likely to drop out of school if they have a relationship with caring adults in the school setting.

The reading interventions are all designed to improve reading ability including reading fluency and comprehension which is also very clearly aligned with high school graduation. Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading are explicit reading interventions that have frequent progress monitoring of reading fluency, decoding, and comprehension. Both are designed to be used at a specified frequency for efficacy (i.e., 60 minutes a day). SRA's Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading are scripted structured reading interventions. The SRA programs are designed with frequent progress monitoring and a specified scope and sequence in addition to the recommended amount of time to be implemented with students. Progress monitoring assesses reading fluency and comprehension. Lexia Core 5 and Lexia Power Up are reading interventions designed to improve reading fluency and comprehension as measured by the reading Lexiles of participants. Lexia Core 5 and Power Up utilize a computer-based platform to provide intervention. Frequent progress monitoring and differentiated literacy instruction are the primary components of these interventions. iReady and iExcel are personalized learning platforms designed to provide targeted literacy intervention.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Each Evidence Based Practice (EBP) supports the SiMR by providing strategies that address each school's root cause analysis needs found in their LEA data analysis. Each addresses the unique needs of each school. Check and Connect and Early Warning Systems address the emotional and academic achievement needs of students, change teacher practice, and build family engagement to support the SiMR. Each of the reading interventions were chosen based upon data analysis and review to meet the achievement needs of the targeted students and to support change in teacher practices. Teachers will implement effective reading instruction leading to improved reading achievement for students with disabilities. The LEA level of interaction has moved from informing to collaborating and transforming.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

All LEAs that implemented intervention strategies and EBPs were implementing EBPs either at the full implementation level or progressing level based upon LEA Plan of Supports, Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly LEA meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the LEA. The State, as part of the collective support provided by School and LEA Improvement and the Division for Special Education Supports and Services collects the following measures of success: LEA Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence to support building capacity and sustainability in the LEA; Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric is used to measure the implementation fidelity of EBPs; benchmark data on EBPs; LEA Annual Survey to measure the level of satisfaction the LEAs have with supports from the State to improve outcomes; State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey to measure the satisfaction around regional technical assistance and coaching; professional learning evaluation survey to measure the satisfaction level of participants with professional learning they receive; LEA Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data to measure the extent to which LEAs are implementing their plan and meeting their expected outcomes; State assessment data on academic proficiency; annual event graduation rates; LEA benchmark data; and data from continuous improvement team meetings to measure increased student achievement and graduation rates.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Six of the selected LEAs posted increases in graduation rate. A 13.4% increase in graduation rates for SWD in Clayton County Schools could indicate a successful implementation of their Early Warning System. Also, both identified schools in Clayton (Jackson, Kilpatrick) demonstrated better than typical growth on the MAP for SWD in both reading and math.

Check and Connect data from Atlanta Public Schools yielded favorable results. Students in targeted schools participating in the intervention showed over 50% improvement in attendance and course completion. The annual event graduation rate for APS SWD improved from 61.9% to 64.09%. The number of student participants reported for specific schools were: Atlanta Public Schools (Kindezi Old 4th Ward 9 , Kindezi West 16. Richmond County hired a transition specialist to review high school student transcripts for SWD which could have resulted in an increase in SWD graduation rates from 60.47% to 71.89. The number of discipline referrals for SWD also improved.

Available literacy intervention data yielded the following results for specified LEAs:

Atlanta Public Schools- Carver Steam Academy (Lexia), Centennial Academy (Read 180), Kipp SOUL Academy (iReady), and Toomer Elementary (Lexia) have 116 students enrolled in their respective programs and are showing overall progress.

Bibb County- VIP Academy (Fast ForWord and Achieve 3000) is tracking 19 students. 89% are making adequate progress during the implementation period. Bibb's graduation rate for SWD increased from 52.67% to 60.29%.

Chatham County (iReady)- Largo-Tibet showed a 4% increase in Lexile scores, while Windsor Forest saw a 6% decrease in Lexile scores. DOE staff should provide additional support in implementation fidelity.

Dekalb (Lexia)- Pine Ridge, Salem, Shadow Rock, Woodridge had a combined increase (10 to 20 students) in the number of students scoring proficient

and higher on English/Language Arts on benchmarks compared to the previous year.

Richmond County (SRA Reading Mastery for elementary and Corrective Reading for middle and high) had 171 participants. Only 38% of students in these programs were on track during implementation. Staff turnover and unfilled positions were cited as major reasons for the programs not being implemented at desirable levels. Increased DOE support with staffing, training, and implementation fidelity is warranted.

The data collected indicated support for the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Check and Connect and Early Warning System: The State will continue to monitor the implementation fidelity and progress of each evidence-based practice and collect on-going quarterly benchmark data. Review of progress will continue to be discussed at the monthly district meeting. SSIP Program Specialists will ask districts to produce progress monitoring data and discuss as well as the level of implementation fidelity. Schools have assigned a point person to monitor the implementation fidelity of each intervention. Districts are encouraged to implement the interventions with fidelity and give them time to show progress before deciding to change them. The SSIP will also help ensure staff are trained and provided the necessary supports for implementation.

Literacy Interventions (SRA Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading, Lexia, iReady, Fast ForWord, Achieve 3000): The State will continue to monitor the implementation fidelity and progress of each evidence-based practice and collect on-going quarterly benchmark data. Review of progress will continue to be discussed at the monthly district meeting. SSIP Program Specialists will ask districts to produce progress monitoring data and discuss as well as the level of implementation fidelity. Schools have an assigned point person to monitor the implementation fidelity of each intervention. Districts are encouraged to implement the interventions with fidelity and give them time to show progress before deciding to change them. The SSIP will also help ensure staff are trained and provided the necessary supports for implementation.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit from the DSESS plans to meet with stakeholders beginning in Spring 2024 to discuss revisions of the current Logic Model and Evaluation Plan. The revisions are based upon current assessment data as reported in this SSIP, amendments to Georgia's ESEA Consolidation Plan, and Georgia's literacy initiatives. The graduation rate for SWD in Georgia has been the only SiMR for the SSIP and has resulted in an increase from 39.46% in 2013 to 69.25% for 2023. Unfortunately, the data for student achievement in the targeted LEAs and schools provided in this report does not show commensurate increases. The achievement rates are significantly below targets in ELA and math and have been for the reporting years following the pandemic. The pandemic and the changes in calculation for assessment for Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR have combined to make the current Mid-term Outcome targets in the Evaluation Plan unrealistic and incomparable to prior results. An updated Evaluation Plan with realistic targets reflecting the change in calculations is being developed and shared with stakeholders for feedback. An additional SiMR goal for literacy will be reviewed with stakeholders for inclusion in the next SPP/APR. Literacy will be targeted based upon the data reported for two consecutive years demonstrating significant weakness in this area. The area of literacy is receiving increased state-wide support from GaDOE. The Instruction and Systemic Improvement Unit from the DSESS will be an integral part of this work and the SSIP should accurately reflect their work with goals that evaluate that work. Georgia's 2023 ESEA Consolidated State Plan Amendment approved by the Federal Department of Education on October 4, 2023. Based on the Amendment (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Pages/default.aspx>), Georgia defines the following categories of schools: Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) identifies 1) the lowest performing 5% of all Title I schools; 2) all high schools with a graduation rate = 67%; and 3) all schools identified for ATSI support for the same student group(s) for six years. CSI schools are identified every three years. Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) identifies any school with one or more consistently underperforming student groups. TSI schools are identified annually. Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) among schools meeting the TSI criteria, identifies any school in which any student group, on its own, would be identified as a CSI school. ATSI schools are identified every three years. ATSI schools must meet a high threshold to exit the ATSI status. At the conclusion of the three years ATSI designation, schools must no longer meet the entrance criteria and demonstrate an improvement in Content Mastery, ELA achievement, mathematics achievement, or science achievement for all identified student groups from the year of identification to the current year. Georgia's Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit from the DSESS will be working with the School Improvement Division to support schools that are designated as ATSI. Based on data from the 2022-2023 school year, 74 schools were identified as ATSI in Georgia and 72 were identified for the SWD subgroup. Many ATSI schools require support in literacy and GaDOE is hiring eight new staff members to address the needs of SWD in these schools. The SSIP Evaluation Plan and Logic Model need to address the expanded instructional support provided to SWD.

On January 17, 2024, The Georgia Superintendent of Education, Richard Woods, announced his appointment of a leader to build a statewide literacy coaching model. The announcement in combination with the recent ESEA Amendment shows the commitment to provide intensive literacy support that is sustainable for all students, including students with disabilities. The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit from the DSESS will be working with the School Improvement Division in implementing literacy support. The SSIP should reflect this work for SWD.

In additional areas, the State Advisory Panel, Collaborative Community stakeholders and other SSIP stakeholders voiced through surveys, virtual discussions and monthly SSIP meetings that more professional learning is needed to address instructional strategies, retention of special education teachers and supports to school based administrators. On the SSIP LEA Annual Survey, stakeholders asked for more training for specially designed instruction, high leverage practices (HLPs), and support to new teachers and administrators. Because of this data the State is expanding Coherent Strategy One: Professional Learning activities.

The Special Education and School Administrator Academy (SESAA) was extremely popular this year. A third cohort began in July 2023 with 253 administrators and high levels of participation and engagement. Five executive coaches support the SSIP work in the schools along with the program specialists. SESAA will continue to provide focused professional learning and coaching to school-based administrators, expanding the SSIP work to the school level, rather than just the LEA level. A website for school administrators has been expanded to meet the needs of schools

To address the request from stakeholders to provide more support in specially designed instruction, the State continues contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey from America's Institute of Research to provide ongoing training and coaching around Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). A webpage was built and is updated frequently with SDI asynchronous and synchronous modules, tools, and resources (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)). The GaDOE is in year four of a five-year commitment to the work of specially designed instruction. A Multi-Sensory Reading Grant to train teachers in multi-sensory reading approaches such as Orton-Gillingham, LETRS, and Wilson Reading and to receive training in Dyslexia was offered to build capacity for special education teachers in literacy. Beginning in July 2022 through December 2022 Multi-Sensory PL sessions were offered to teachers and administrators. To increase teacher access to the PL, recordings are available in the GaDOE PL catalog. The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit works directly with the Georgia Learning Resource Systems (GLRS) directors and has offered SDI and Multi-Sensory learning PL for K-12 teachers. GLRS provides support and resources for all SSIP initiatives.

In partnership with Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR), The Teacher Provider Retention Program provides professional development on High Leverage Practices to new special education teachers. Great Teacher Leaders and several higher education institutions have also been implemented to support Coherent Strategies 1 Professional Learning and address outcomes for mid-term goals around student achievement and graduation rates. Each of these additional PL projects are to support the short and mid-term goals related to student achievement and building capacity. Additional professional learning events are supported as turnover of LEA and school leadership and teachers remains high. It is necessary to continue to train new LEA leaders and teachers. Stakeholder input, survey results and data trend analytics reviews indicated we are making progress with our current activities but must continue to build capacity and address challenges around retention. Stakeholders continue to ask for specific digital tools and resources to guide the work of SSIP. The SSIP collaborates with Georgia's Teacher Provider Retention Program to help selected LEAs recruit and retain special education teachers.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continued with its vision 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 and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020-2025. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 13, 2023, November 10, 2023, and January 17, 2024. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in an in-person work session on September 13, 2023. During the meeting, projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2022 were presented by one of the Part B Data Managers to the SAP with numerous guiding questions and opportunities for discussion. To facilitate engagement, SAP members worked in small groups of four to five people to offer responses to the guided questions. Each small group had a recorder to compile responses to the questions. There was also an opportunity to verbally discuss the responses with the entire SAP. The Part B Data Manager collected all responses to share with the SAP in a meeting conducted November 8, 2023. The meeting also provided an opportunity to continue to share information on SPP/APR Indicators. The SAP meeting on January 17, 2024 focused on Indicator 3 Assessment. SAP members actively discussed the assessment results and interventions for improving the performance of students with disabilities on these assessments. These presentations were made publicly available at ([https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)).

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. In the meetings on September 13, 2023, November 8, 2023, and January 17, 2024, program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. These presentations and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were additional opportunities for diverse groups of parents, special educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These are described in the Parent Engagement section and Activities. On September 14, 2023, one of the Part B Data Managers and a special education director from an LEA presented in-person to a group of over 50 parents, parent mentors, LEA special education directors, LEA leaders, and state LEA leaders on Indicators 3 and 8. These Indicators were targeted to enable greater participant understanding and to increase parent participation on the Parent Survey for Indicator 8. On September 27, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided a virtual informational and feedback opportunity to over 60 beginning special education directors who were participating in Georgia's Special Education Leadership Development Academy. The virtual presentation and feedback opportunity provided an overview of the entire SPP/APR and current data. On October 18, 2023, the Part B Data Managers provided an opportunity for feedback to a group of over 50 participants from the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) and special education program specialists from the DSESS. The GLRS is a network of 18 regional programs that provide training and resources to school district personnel, parents of

students with disabilities, and other interested individuals to support the functional and academic achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary success of students with disabilities. The focus of this session was operationalizing Indicator 3 assessment data with LEAs for improving instruction for students with disabilities.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

SSIP stakeholder engagement was conducted virtually using TEAMS and one in person session with the State Advisory Panel on September 13, 2023. Stakeholders were invited via email, through SSIP points of contacts, Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership, GLRS (Georgia Learning Resource System) and individual phone calls. Stakeholders were given multiple opportunities and ways to respond and provide feedback. Several virtual tools were used to gather input such as chat boxes, small group breakout discussions, surveys, Mentimeter, Easy Retro, and virtual whiteboards. Each of the stakeholder groups had opportunities to provide suggestions regarding changes in improvement strategies and activities. In addition, stakeholders were invited to address concerns they had about the implementation activities or to make recommendations for improvement between meetings through phone and email communication.

The SSIP has a webpage (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/SSIP-.aspx>) which posts SSIP guides, resources and tools to support the implementation of the SSIP. It publishes previous reports, ongoing professional learning opportunities, fidelity measures, logic model and evaluation plans. These resources and tools provide access to any stakeholder if they want to learn more about the SSIP work.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

There were continued concerns about student assessment results, poor student attendance, school-based administrators being novice to special education, and special education teacher retention. As stated above, the State has implemented the teacher provider retention program to support the retention and training of new special education teachers. The SSIP is providing a School-Based Administrator Academy with mixed reality simulations to support novice administrators. Several professional learning resources have been created to support increasing engagement and attendance. The State reports on progress of addressing the issues to stakeholders on a regular basis. Stakeholders also expressed concerns about the state level assessment results for students with disabilities and the increase in the achievement gap based on assessment results. As indicated throughout this document, these concerns are being addressed through numerous initiatives including the Specially Designed Instruction initiative. Multiple K-12 virtual professional learning opportunities are offered to teachers in multi-sensory learning strategies in spelling and vocabulary, and classroom engagement strategies.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

The State has no other activities to describe.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Not Applicable

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

The State has not identified any new barriers. Georgia continues to seek solutions to everyday challenges and provide support to districts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Wina Low

Title:

State Director

Email:

wlow@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone:

470 316 8636

Submitted on:

04/23/24 12:17:18 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results			
Compliance			

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**		

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.			
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation			
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday			
Indicator 13: Secondary transition			
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data			
Timely State Complaint Decisions			
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions			
Longstanding Noncompliance			
Specific Conditions			
Uncorrected identified noncompliance			

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>