

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

75

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Overview of Issue and Description of System or Process:

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section assumes primary responsibility for the exceptional student education (ESE) monitoring and dispute resolution functions for the state's 75 school districts.

Monitoring System

The bureau implements a leveled (tiered) system of compliance monitoring. All districts participate in an annual self-assessment process. Based on specific criteria and data analyzed each year, some districts participate in an on-site monitoring and technical assistance visit.

Districts participate in Level 1 monitoring by completing Web-based self-assessment protocols related to selected ESE procedures. In addition, some districts may be required to complete additional self-assessment(s) in Level 2 monitoring by completing indicator-specific "focused" protocols. Level 2 monitoring may coincide with Level 1 monitoring. On-site monitoring and technical assistance for selected districts (Level 3) are conducted in addition to Level 1 and any required Level 2 activities.

Self-Assessment

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

Self-assessment is the process whereby districts undertake the review of critical components of their ESE programs. Districts are responsible for conducting the self-assessment and for identifying and reporting on required corrective actions. Information from these protocols is submitted to the bureau via the ESE General Supervision Website (GSW). Corrective action plans and

correction of noncompliance findings are also reported and tracked via this website.

Validation

An effective system of general supervision requires that monitoring procedures and protocols are consistent to ensure the integrity of the process. The bureau implements a validation process as a means through which bureau staff validate the accuracy of data obtained from the district's self-assessment.

On-Site Monitoring and Technical Assistance (Level 3)

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

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

Criteria for Selection of Districts

For 2014-2015, 13 districts were selected for on-site monitoring and technical assistance based on four key indicators closely associated with equity and access to appropriate education.

Those indicators include:

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

Key components of the bureau's on-site monitoring and technical assistance process include:

1. Examination of multiple data sources to guide the data-based planning and problem-solving process to include:
 - selection of districts with the greatest need for monitoring and technical assistance of compliance in targeted areas
 - Previsit, on-site and follow-up activities
2. Development of a state-level support team for each selected district composed of a variety of personnel, including:

- Bureau staff members
 - Other FDOE personnel
 - Discretionary project staff
3. Inclusion of specific discretionary project staff in the monitoring and technical assistance process for the purpose of coordinating continued long-term support, interventions and professional development based on the primary focus area of the project and the corresponding primary needs of the districts
 4. Provision of technical assistance regarding the data-based planning and problem-solving process to ensure that districts have the supports, skills and knowledge needed to implement district action plans
 5. Involvement that will be sustained over time by both bureau and select discretionary project staff for the purposes of:
 - Monitoring fidelity of the implementation of district plans
 - Evaluating the effectiveness of actions taken through the achievement of specific district goals and positive changes in district outcome data

Additional sources of information regarding the bureau's monitoring process may be found at <http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/monitoring>.

Dispute Resolution

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

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

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

Due Process Hearings: Due process hearing requests are submitted by parents to the local education agency (LEA), and forwarded by the LEA to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH), the agency that conducts the hearings. Administrative law judges (ALJs), who are employed by DOAH and provided training by the FDOE, make determinations regarding the cases and provide information to the bureau. FDOE maintains the records following completion of the cases and provides oversight for the system (timelines, review of orders, training of ALJs, etc.).

Data related to the corrective actions identified through complaints and due process are maintained by the bureau.

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

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

History: The bureau team members began each effort with the question, "What are the desired outcomes and how will they be measured?" In 2011, it was established that the desired outcome of our systemic effort was to provide a model of multi-tiered support to districts. This integrated system of supports, services, skills and resources is evidenced by:

- An established universal screening system for determining levels of support needed by school districts
- A dynamic method (organizational structure that enables the flexible distribution of bureau resources based on specific need) for responding to those needs with integrated tools/products/resources for building capacity to support successful outcomes for students
- An annual increase in districts' knowledge, skills, practices and satisfaction with bureau support
- An increase to 100 percent of SPP indicator targets met by 2017

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

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

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

- BEESS, MTSS and Student Support Services website
- Special Programs and Procedures (SP&P) structure
- Technical assistance papers
- Publications and professional development
- Web-available resources via discretionary projects
- ESE compliance manual
- Various bureau-hosted presentations (Administrator's Management Meeting [AMM], Council of Administrators of Special Education [CASE])
- Discretionary project administration (liaisons, project tracking system [PTS], calls and meetings)

- Professional development portal
- Statewide IEP system with facilitated IEP training
- LEA profiles and databook
- Family and community engagement efforts (brochures, videos, Family Café)
- Level 1 self-assessments
- GSW
- Bureau engagement and contribution to department-wide efforts

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

- Targeted assistance in specific indicators from bureau indicator teams
- Size-alike and/or issue-alike problem-solving groups facilitated at AMM
- Directors' conference calls and topical calls for district supervisors
- Targeted attention and assistance from projects (by district/school request)
- Daily, quick-response correspondence (families, district, school, organizations)
- Level 2 self-assessment
- GSW for voluntary district use
- Various bureau presentations in response to a reported need (Institute for Small and Rural Districts, Working with the Experts, etc.)
- informal conflict resolution between educators and families
- Program area staff specialization and regular district contact calls

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

- MORE individualized, targeted assistance (e.g., specific indicator support from bureau indicator teams)
- MORE individualized, targeted attention and assistance from projects (by district/school request)
- GSW for target districts
- Level 3 on-site monitoring visits and corrective actions
- Formal mediation between educators and families
- State complaint procedures, including corrective actions

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

The State has mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs. This mechanism is based on the needs of districts and managed through the five-year BEESS Strategic Plan. Each strategic plan team focuses on specific needs and provides professional development through BEESS staff, discretionary projects and other professionals.

The following are examples of professional development that was provided by discretionary projects related to best practices for inclusion: Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE), Disability Awareness; Differentiating Instruction, Universal Design for Learning, Accessible Instructional Materials, Access to General Curriculum, and Accommodations/Modifications.

Examples of professional development provided by discretionary projects relating to best practices for literacy and STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) were: Access Points/Essential Understandings, Differentiating Reading Instruction, Differentiating Math Instruction, Differentiating Science Instruction, Access to General Curriculum, Specially Designed Instruction and Interventions, Working with the Experts for Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, Working with the Experts for Speech and Language, Accommodations for Students with Visual Impairments Using Assistive Technology, Strategic Instruction Model, Assessment, and Technology for Student Success: Tools for Reading Comprehension.

Professional development provided by discretionary projects related to positive behavior and student engagement included, Positive Behavior Support: Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement and Participation (CHAMPS); Crisis Prevention Institute; Discipline in the Secondary Classroom; Behavior Remediation Strategies; Solutions to Classroom Discipline; Non-violent Crisis Intervention; and Behavior Management for Paraprofessionals.

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

Professional development provided by discretionary projects related to graduation and transition included, Check and Connect Mentor Training, Early Warning Systems, Drop-Out Prevention for Students with Disabilities, Using School-level Data to Increase Graduation Success of Students with Disabilities, Discovery Process for Students in Transition, Building Work Skills for Employment Success: Strategies and Resources, and Best Practices in Transition.

Discretionary projects provided training to meet district needs pertaining to parent involvement. These trainings were designed to promote effective parent participation in the education of children who are exceptional or have special needs. In addition, over 180 trainings were provided to 8,925 attendees at the 2015 Family Café Conference. These trainings are listed at <http://www.familycafe.net/images/stories/pdf/files/registrationbrochure2015.pdf>.

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

BEESS staff and other professionals provided professional development at the annual AMM. Specific professional development sessions provided at AMM in 2015 included:

- Don't We Already Do Inclusion?
- Hot IDEA Topics and FAQs: The Child-Find and Evaluation Process and Discipline of Students with Disabilities
- A High Tide Floats All Boats: All Hands on Deck to Meet the Needs of All Students Through Lesson Study
- Creating a Culture of Differentiation
- Evaluations: Rights and Responsibilities
- Integration! Engaging and Serving Students
- BEESS Web Applications and Data Management Systems Showcase
- STEM: The Cohesive Learning Paradigm for ALL Students
- What's Up in Dispute Resolution and Monitoring – Bringing You Up to Date and Hearing from You on What We Can Do Better!
- Context Prevention Response (CPR) for Safe and Healthy Learners
- 2015-2016 Statewide Assessment Landscape

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

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

Florida's State Advisory Committee has also been a critical stakeholder group for the development of the SPP and the APR. A draft of the initial targets was provided to this group and input was taken at their December 14-15, 2015, meeting. Those recommendations will be shared with the strategic plan teams, and revisions to the targets will be made, if necessary. The advisory committee contains a majority of members who are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. In addition, the committee has representatives that are appointed by the governor, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other state agencies involved in financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter schools, a representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care, and representatives from the state juvenile and adult corrections agencies.

BEES also has an advisory group that represents LEAs called the Bureau/District Partnership. This group is intended to ensure continued effective communication between the bureau and LEAs in the areas of ESE and student services. These partners are comprised of 20 district-level ESE and student services directors, one representative from the Florida CASE, one representative from the Florida Association of Student Services Administrators and five administrators within the bureau. The Bureau/District Partnership is also offered opportunities to provide ongoing input to the SPP and APR as needed.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Within 120 days following the Florida's submission of the APR, LEA profiles will be produced and posted on the FDOE website. The LEA profiles are intended as a tool for use in planning for systemic improvement in exceptional education programs. The profiles contain a series of data indicators that describe measures of educational benefit, educational environment, prevalence and parent involvement for each LEA in the state. Also included in the APR is information about

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

state-level targets from Florida's SPP/APR, LEA performance on the indicators and whether the LEA met each of the state's targets. Past LEA profiles can be found at <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data>.

In addition to the LEA profiles, more detailed information about assessment participation and proficiency can be found in the annually produced Databook, also found at <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data>.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			39.80%	40.30%	40.30%	43.50%	49.00%	51.00%	47.00%	54.30%
Data		37.40%	39.90%	45.20%	43.00%	47.00%	48.70%	44.40%	47.70%	52.32%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	54.30% 55.30%	56.30% 58.30%	58.30% 60.30%	60.30% 62.30%	62.30% 64.30%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

The targets entered in the FFY 2013 report were incorrect and do not match the targets in Indicator 17, which should be identical. This is correction rather than an update. The target for Indicator 1 must be the same as the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Extensive stakeholder input was sought and is described at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/eseaflex/approved-requests/f12extreq814.pdf>.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the BEESS of the FDOE. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate and post-school outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of BEESS staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC include representatives from the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Family Network on Disabilities
- Florida College System
- Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- Florida Department of Education Division of Blind Services
- Florida Department of Education Division of Career and Technical Education
- Florida Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from BEESS and the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Florida College System
- Florida Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Education Division of Career and Technical Education
- Florida Department of Education Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System
- SEDNET
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System

This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionality as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 must be the same as the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Extensive stakeholder input was sought and is described at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/eseaflex/approved-requests/fl2extreq814.pdf>.


Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	12,898	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	23,424	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	55.06%	Calculate 

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
12,898	23,424	52.32%	54.30%	55.06%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

To earn a standard diploma in Florida, the cohort of students who graduated in 2014 was required to meet the course, credit and assessment requirements listed below. These requirements were identical for students with and without disabilities, with the exception of a waiver of standardized assessment results that IEP teams can grant to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3)(c), Florida Statutes.

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

Four credits in mathematics, which must include Algebra I and Geometry. The statewide, standardized Algebra I end-of-course (EOC) assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student who took Algebra I or Geometry after the 2010-2011 school year must take the statewide, standardized EOC assessment for the course, but is not required to pass the assessment in order to earn course credit. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education may substitute the certification for one mathematics credit. Substitution may occur for up to two mathematics credits, except for Algebra I and Geometry.

Three credits in science, two of which must have a laboratory component. A student who takes Biology I after the 2010-2011

school year must take the statewide, standardized Biology I EOC assessment, but is not required to pass the assessment in order to earn course credit. A student's performance on the assessment is not required to constitute 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education may substitute the certification for one science credit, except for Biology I.

Three credits in social studies of which one credit in World History, one credit in United States History, one-half credit in United States Government, and one-half credit in economics are required. A student who takes United States History after the 2011-2012 school year must take the statewide, standardized United States History EOC assessment, but the student's performance on the assessment is not required to constitute 30 percent of the student's final course grade.

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

One credit in physical education.

Eight credits in electives.

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

Florida also collects data on students who take longer than four years to complete graduation requirements. Although these students are not counted in the federal uniform graduation rate, earning a standard diploma greatly increases their educational and career opportunities. The noncohort graduation rate that corresponds to the federal uniform rate reported above was 59.9 percent.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			4.25%	4.00%	4.00%	3.75%	3.50%	3.25%	3.00%	18.60%
Data		5.52%	5.39%	4.40%	4.40%	4.24%	4.00%	3.70%	3.38%	20.35%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	16.80%	15.10%	13.40%	11.70%	10.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Indicator 2: Drop Out
FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	13,071	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	4,426	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	null	null
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	4,197	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	111	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
4,197	21,805	20.35%	16.80%	19.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup
FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/11/2016	Number of districts in the State	75	75

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
75	null	null	0%			Incomplete Data	n/a

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
			Data		94.00%	96.50%	96.10%	97.80%	98.00%	97.90%	95.60%	95.80%	95.58%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
			Data		94.00%	96.50%	96.10%	97.70%	97.90%	98.00%	96.40%	95.40%	95.70%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 3/3/2016

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	31479	28950	28141	26719	24838	25861	26088	24428	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	28103	25213	24461	22301	20271	21062	20098	18381			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	92	77	68	52	58	30	33	41			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2688	2782	2781	2798	2806	2923	2833	2692			

Data Source: Date:

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	31376	28872	27975	26444	24652	25731	0	0	0	0	53425
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	28029	25536	24722	22657	20569	21094					42145
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	84	77	50	39	46	26					273
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2675	2793	2764	2800	2807	2916					5500

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	216,504	202,644	95.58%	99.00%	93.60%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

While participation rates remained constant in the elementary grades, there was some slippage in middle school and high school grades with the greatest slippage at the high school level. At these higher grades, data were analyzed and steps are being taken to work with districts and grades where slippage occurred.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	218,475	207,602	95.70%	99.00%	95.02%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results are accessible online at <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			33.00%	38.00%	43.00%	48.00%	53.00%	40.00%	34.00%	47.00%
			Data		27.70%	29.90%	31.60%	35.62%	35.60%	34.60%	29.20%	28.40%	28.98%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			34.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	45.00%	37.00%	47.00%
			Data		35.30%	32.40%	35.30%	39.95%	40.70%	40.70%	31.30%	31.70%	32.09%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	51.00%	51.00% 56.00%	56.00% 61.00%	61.00% 66.00%	66.00% 71.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	51.00%	51.00% 56.00%	56.00% 61.00%	61.00% 66.00%	66.00% 72.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

With implementation of the new Florida Standards Assessment, based on more rigorous standards, it has become necessary to establish a new baseline and reset targets for subsequent administrations. The FFY 2014 assessment will serve as the new baseline.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? no

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) Date: 3/3/2016

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	30883	28072	27310	25151	23135	24015	22964	21114	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6938	5642	4331	3428	3153	4190	3591	3135			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	26	21	23	14	9	11	18			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1826	2029	2093	2056	2002	2076	1991	1852			

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) Date: 3/3/2016

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	30788	28406	27536	25496	23422	24036	0	0	0	0	47918
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9072	7629	5946	4016	4394	6015					8093
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	27	20	10	10	13	9					83

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1813	1944	1972	2018	2097	2121					3802

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	202,644	50,479	28.98%	51.00%	24.91%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Florida implemented new statewide ELA, Math and EOC assessments in 2015. With new, more rigorous standards in place to help Florida students succeed, the previous assessment no longer served the purpose of measuring student progress and achievement. The new assessments are based on these more rigorous standards designed to prepare all students for college, career and life.

With initial implementation of the new assessments, Florida is establishing a new baseline and has reset targets for subsequent years.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	207,602	61,104	32.09%	51.00%	29.43%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Florida implemented new statewide ELA, Math and EOC assessments in 2015. With new, more rigorous standards in place to help Florida students succeed, the previous assessment no longer served the purpose of measuring student progress and achievement. The new assessments are based on these more rigorous standards designed to prepare all students for college, career and life.

With initial implementation of the new assessments, Florida is establishing a new baseline and has reset targets for subsequent years.

Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results are accessible online at <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			11.90%	7.50%	7.50%	3.00%	0%	0%	0%	11.00%
Data		19.40%	5.90%	9.00%	9.00%	9.70%	14.90%	8.30%	13.04%	7.69%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	9.00%	7.00%	4.00%	2.00%	0%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

The Positive Behavior/Student Engagement Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from BEESS and the following partner organizations:

- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System
- Institute for Small and Rural Districts
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional or Behavioral Disabilities
- Positive Behavior Support: Multi-tiered System of Supports
- Safe Schools

This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and students with and without disabilities as they developed the strategic plan.

In addition, the State Strategic Plan, which includes this data and action steps the PB/SE team has developed, is shared with the State Advisory Committee for input as appropriate.

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/11/2016	Number of districts in the State	75	75

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
5	43	7.69%	9.00%	11.63%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Slippage

Florida experienced an overall increase in the students with disabilities (SWD) population which led to an increase in the number of districts that met the criteria to be included in the Indicator 4a calculation. Technical assistance on positive behavioral supports and alternatives to suspension has been provided to districts; Targeted technical assistance to the districts that had increases have been provided.

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy for indicator 4A is defined as a risk ratio of three or higher when comparing students with disabilities to children without disabilities within the LEA. Districts are excluded from the calculation when they have fewer than 10 students with disabilities who are suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.

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

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Districts have developed policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards through their districts' policies and procedures manuals (SP&Ps). BEESS district liaisons utilized federal and state requirements as a guide in their review of each district's SP&P. Feedback was provided to districts, and the districts revised as needed, to ensure policy and procedural compliance with 34 CFR § 300.170.

In addition, targeted districts were visited during the 2014-2015 school year by BEESS and discretionary project staff in order to assist districts with focused problem solving, which included the development of district action plans that addressed policies, procedures and practices contributing to disparate discipline rates, appropriate training, and interventions and progress monitoring. Participating discretionary projects included the Florida Positive Behavior Interventions and Support: Multi-tiered System of Supports, Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities, Centers for Autism and Related Disabilities, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System Associate Centers and Problem Solving and Response to Intervention. These projects were utilized based on their project focus and project staff have continued their involvement and progress monitoring with these districts.

BEESS discretionary projects also provided assistance and intervention related to positive behavioral interventions and supports to increase student engagement and reduce suspensions and expulsions, available to all districts statewide.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/11/2016	Number of districts in the State	75	75

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
22	0	38	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy for indicator 4B is defined as a risk ratio of three or higher for a specific racial/ethnic group when comparing students with disabilities to children without disabilities within the LEA. Districts are excluded from the calculation when they have fewer than 10 students with disabilities from a specific racial/ethnic group who are suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Districts have developed policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards through their districts' policies and procedures manual (SP&Ps). BEESS district liaisons utilized federal and state requirements as a guide in their review of each district's SP&P. Feedback was provided to districts, and the districts revised as needed, to ensure policy and procedural compliance with 34 CFR 300.170.

In addition, targeted districts were visited during the 2014-2015 school year by BEESS and discretionary project staff in order to assist districts with focused problem solving, which included the development of district action plans which addressed policies, procedures and practices contributing to disparate discipline rates, appropriate training and interventions and progress monitoring. Participating discretionary projects included the Florida Positive Behavior Interventions and Support: Multi-tiered System of Supports, Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities, Centers for Autism and Related Disabilities, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System Associate Centers and Problem Solving and Response to Intervention. These projects were utilized based on their project focus and project staff have continued their involvement and progress monitoring with these districts.

BEESS discretionary projects also provide assistance and intervention related to positive behavioral interventions and supports to increase student engagement and reduce suspensions and expulsions, available to all districts statewide.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			54.80%	56.80%	58.80%	60.80%	61.80%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%
		Data		54.40%	57.90%	62.19%	64.34%	67.40%	69.20%	69.30%	70.70%	71.28%
B	2005	Target ≤			23.30%	22.30%	21.30%	19.30%	18.30%	14.00%	12.00%	11.00%
		Data		23.20%	21.50%	18.40%	16.90%	15.81%	14.90%	14.90%	14.40%	14.62%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.70%	2.70%	2.60%	2.60%	2.50%	3.00%	2.50%	2.25%
		Data		3.00%	1.80%	3.30%	3.52%	3.55%	3.60%	3.80%	4.00%	4.05%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	77.00%	79.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%
Target B ≤	10.00%	9.00%	8.00%	7.00%	6.00%
Target C ≤	2.00%	1.75%	1.50%	1.25%	1.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the Best Practices for Inclusion Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and supported by the BEESS of the FDOE. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. This team analyzed data regarding districts' identified priorities on their required Best Practices in Inclusive Education self-assessment. Team members also reviewed state/district-level data related to inclusion in relation to disability type, age, district, and transitions from elementary to secondary settings. It is important to note that the indicators are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

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

- Bureau of Standards and Instructional Support
- Florida Inclusion Network

- Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resource Systems
- Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Strategic Instruction Model Initiative

Indicator 5: Education Environments

(children 6-21)

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	<u>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</u>	324,767	319,338
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<u>A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</u>	237,721	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<u>B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</u>	41,219	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<u>c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</u>	9,490	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<u>c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</u>	662	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<u>c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</u>	2,352	null

Explanation of Alternate Data

Florida does not include students served in correctional facilities or parentally placed private school students in the denominator (total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21) because the placement of these students is not an IEP team decision. These students (2,357 served in corrections facilities and 3,072 parentally placed private school students) have been removed from the figure posted above of 324,767 for the purposes of determining LRE. This is consistent with previously reported data for indicator 5.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	237,721	319,338	71.28%	77.00%	74.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	41,219	319,338	14.62%	10.00%	12.91%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	12,504	319,338	4.05%	2.00%	3.92%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

**Indicator 5: Education Environments
(children 6-21)**

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									32.00%	28.00%
		Data									29.76%	27.20%
B	2011	Target ≤									47.00%	50.30%
		Data									48.89%	51.30%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	33.00%	38.00%	43.00%	48.00%	50.00%
Target B ≤	49.30%	48.30%	47.30%	46.30%	45.30%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input explained in the introduction, input from other stakeholders for this indicator was also received from the Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team, a team formed and supported by BEESS, FDOE. Input was gathered through both face-to-face meetings as well as conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to educational environments in which children with disabilities ages 3 through 5 years are served. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results.

The Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from BEESS, the following discretionary projects as well as partner organizations:

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

OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State indicated that LEAs did not report the data correctly. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<u>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</u>	38,158	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<u>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</u>	10,300	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<u>b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</u>	18,071	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<u>b2. Number of children attending separate school</u>	1,447	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<u>b3. Number of children attending residential facility</u>	13	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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	10,300	38,158	28.33%	33.00%	26.99%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	19,531	38,158	51.24%	49.30%	51.18%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of A Slippage

Florida demonstrated slippage of 1.34 percent. While the slippage was relatively small, a close examination of the data reveal that a few large districts account for the decline. As a result, we will be working closely with these districts to determine the root cause of the slippage and develop next steps to address.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State indicated that LEAs did not report the data correctly. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						65.90%	66.00%	66.10%	66.20%	63.60%
		Data					65.90%	70.60%	67.20%	63.30%	63.10%	64.19%
A2	2008	Target ≥						75.80%	75.90%	76.00%	76.10%	82.40%
		Data					75.80%	84.10%	82.90%	82.00%	81.90%	80.99%
B1	2008	Target ≥						59.00%	59.10%	59.20%	59.30%	63.90%
		Data					58.80%	65.60%	65.90%	63.50%	63.40%	63.40%
B2	2008	Target ≥						52.90%	53.00%	53.10%	53.20%	68.90%
		Data					52.90%	64.40%	67.90%	68.20%	68.40%	67.84%
C1	2008	Target ≥						59.50%	59.60%	59.70%	59.80%	55.40%
		Data					59.50%	60.70%	58.30%	54.20%	54.90%	53.70%
C2	2008	Target ≥						73.30%	73.40%	73.50%	73.60%	79.50%
		Data					73.30%	80.80%	80.40%	79.40%	79.00%	77.70%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	64.60%	66.10%	68.10%	70.60%	73.60%
Target A2 ≥	82.90%	83.40%	83.90%	84.40%	84.90%
Target B1 ≥	64.90%	66.40%	68.40%	70.90%	73.90%
Target B2 ≥	69.90%	71.40%	73.40%	75.90%	78.90%
Target C1 ≥	56.40%	57.90%	59.90%	62.40%	65.40%
Target C2 ≥	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input explained in the introduction, input from other stakeholders for this indicator was also received from the Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team, as well as the state's Child Outcomes Advisory Committee. See Indicator 6 for representatives of Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team. The Child Outcomes Advisory Committee is composed of school district and Local Early Steps representatives as well as those members of the State Child Outcomes Leadership Team. Both the Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team and the state's Child Outcomes Advisory

Committee reviewed and provided recommendations regarding target setting and quality assurance strategies.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	0.00
--	------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	232.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1448.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	514.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2595.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6416.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3109.00	4789.00	64.19%	64.60%	64.92%	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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	9011.00	11205.00	80.99%	82.90%	80.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	314.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2431.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1013.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3452.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3995.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of	4465.00	7210.00	63.40%	64.90%	61.93%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	7447.00	11205.00	67.84%	69.90%	66.46%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Florida demonstrated a slippage of 1.47 percentage points for B1. The initial analysis does not suggest a single cause for the slippage. Further analysis of alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment will occur. The analysis may result in recommendations for changes for FFY 2015 APR, including new baseline data as applicable. Florida’s preschool discretionary projects will continue to provide professional development to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Florida demonstrated a slippage of 1.38 percentage points for B2. The initial analysis does not suggest a single cause for the slippage. Further analysis of alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment will occur. The analysis may result in recommendations for changes for FFY 2015 APR, including new baseline data as applicable. Florida’s preschool discretionary projects will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	261.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1869.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	441.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2230.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6404.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2671.00	4801.00	53.70%	56.40%	55.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	8634.00	11205.00	77.70%	80.00%	77.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? Yes

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Preschool	2008	Target ≥					38.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	75.00%	75.00%
		Data					43.00%	53.00%	56.10%	53.90%	75.60%	73.19%
School Age	2008	Target ≥						40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	75.00%	75.00%
		Data					32.00%	39.60%	40.40%	43.20%	74.50%	75.63%

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

Explanation of Changes

No changes were made.

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	76.00%	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	87.00%
School-age Target ≥	76.00%	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	87.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

- University of South Florida Student Support Services Project: School of Social Work
- Florida Department of Education Office of Independent Education and Parental Choice
- University of South Florida Student Support Services Project: School Nurses
- Florida’s Positive Behavior Support: Multi-Tiered System of Supports Project
- Piedra Data Systems
- State Personnel Development Grant
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System
- SEDNET
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- University of Miami's Exceptional Student Education Parent Survey Project

In addition to the Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team, parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of BEESS staff and school district personnel all provided input, including the following staff from partner organizations, discretionary projects and advisory committees:

- The State Advisory Council for the Education of Exceptional Students
- The Family Café
- Central Florida Parent Center
- Parents of the Panhandle Information Network
- Parent Information Network
- Parent to Parent (of Miami)
- Florida Developmental Disability Council
- Family Network on Disabilities

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	1961.00	2717.00	73.19%	76.00%	72.18%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
School-age	14874.00	20016.00	75.63%	76.00%	74.31%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Preschool Slippage

For 2014-15, the preschool survey had a total of 2,717 respondents and of those respondents, 1,961 (72.2 percent) had scores that were at or above the item agreement standard of 84 percent. This resulted in slippage of 2.8 percent for the preschool survey. There is insufficient information available to determine if the change is attributable to specific activities or to normal variation when surveying a large population.

Explanation of School-age Slippage

For 2014-15, the K-12 survey had a total of 20,016 respondents and of those respondents, 14,874 (74.3 percent) had scores that were at or above the item agreement standard of 84 percent. This resulted in slippage of .6 percent for the K-12 survey. There is insufficient information available to determine if the change is attributable to specific activities or to normal variation when surveying a large population.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

For the FFY 2014, parents of children with disabilities were surveyed using two separate surveys consisting of the items developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring, which addresses parents' perceptions of schools' efforts to facilitate parent involvement. One survey was developed for parents of preschool children with disabilities and one for parents of school-aged children with disabilities, Grades K-12. Both surveys were available online with a limited amount of paper surveys available. One-third of districts received paper surveys prepopulated with student information that were delivered to schools for dissemination. (One-third of districts will receive paper surveys each year over a three-year period). Both surveys were available in English and Spanish. Data files with student demographic information were prepared by the department and sent to the department contractor responsible for setting up the parent surveys online. These demographic data were used to match information input by parents responding to the surveys online.

The measures used for this indicator were calculated as the percentage of respondents whose *percent item agreement* is at or above a state-established standard. The *percent item agreement* was calculated as the percentage of items to which a respondent selected a response of "agree," "strongly agree" or "very strongly agree," divided by the number of items to which the respondent provided a response. For parents of preschool children, the item agreement standard was set at 84 percent, while the standard for K-12 was set at 72 percent. To consider the standard as met, 75 percent of respondents to the preschool and K-12 surveys must have met or exceeded these standards.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses of preschool respondent data with the population of preschool children with disabilities reported by race/ethnicity shows that parent respondents identified as white were overrepresented by a 7.6 percent margin, while parent respondents identified as black were underrepresented by 9.3 percent and parent respondents identified as Hispanic were overrepresented by 1.7 percent. For the remaining categories of Asian/Pacific, American Indian/Alaskan Native and for preschool respondents identified as two or more races, results differed by less than 1 percent with the population of preschool students reported for those categories.

Additional analyses of K-12 data shows Asian/Pacific, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and two or more races respondents closely corresponding to the population of K-12 students with disabilities by matching exactly or by less than one percentage difference. Respondents identified as white were overrepresented by a margin of 6.4 percent, while black respondents were underrepresented by 9.8 percent and Hispanic respondents overrepresented by 3.3 percent.

Preschool survey data identified by the primary exceptionality reveals all categories of disabilities were closely representative (less than 1 percent) of the population of preschool children identified for those areas of exceptionality.

Analyses of K-12 respondents shows underrepresentation in two of the seven categories of exceptionalities. This includes the percentage of K-12 students with specific learning disabilities underrepresented by 9.2 percent and emotional behavioral disabilities by 1.4 percent. Overrepresentation of respondents was reported when comparing survey respondents with the population of K-12 students identified with autism spectrum disorder by 6.3 percent, intellectual disabilities by 1.6 percent and other health impairments by 1.4 percent. Other exceptionalities (e.g., deaf/hard of hearing, visually impaired, traumatic brain injured, dual sensory impaired, orthopedically impaired and hospital/homebound) results differed by less than 1 percent with the population reported for those categories.

Further analyses of primary and secondary grades showed an overrepresentation of respondents identifying with primary grade students to the population of students enrolled in K-5 by an 11.2 percent margin, while respondents reported for the secondary school grade students were shown to be underrepresented by a margin of 11.2 percent.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State
- No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/11/2016	Number of districts in the State	75	75

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	73	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Florida defines "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 3.5 or higher for overrepresentation. Westat's risk ratio method is used for calculating disproportionate representation with a minimum "n" size of 30.

Two districts were excluded from all calculations due to a total population of students with disabilities of less than 30. The number of districts excluded from the calculation by racial/ethnic group for not meeting the state-established minimum cell size of 30 are as follows:

Racial/Ethnic Group	Districts Removed from the Calculation
White, not Hispanic	3
Black, not Hispanic	11
Hispanic	20
Asian	48
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	73
American Indian/Alaska Native	63

Two or more races	34
-------------------	----

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	4.17%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/11/2016	Number of districts in the State	75	75

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	70	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Florida defines “disproportionate representation” as a risk ratio of 3.5 or higher for over representation. Westat’s risk ratio method is used for calculating disproportionate representation with a minimum “n” size of 30.

Six districts were excluded from all calculations for not meeting the minimum cell size. The number of districts excluded from the calculation for not meeting the state-established minimum cell size of 30 in all races by disability category are as follows:

	Intellectual Disability	Specific Learning Disability	Emotional/ Behavioral Disability	Speech or Language Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Autism Spectrum Disorder
Number of districts with all races excluded	24	9	36	6	27	30

The number of districts excluded from the calculation by racial/ethnic group and disability for not meeting the state-established minimum cell size of 30 are as follows:

Racial Ethnic Group	Intellectual Disability	Specific Learning Disability	Emotional/ Behavioral Disability	Speech or Language Impairment	Other Health Impairment	Autism Spectrum Disorder
---------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

White, not Hispanic	29	11	37	9	28	30
Black, not Hispanic	41	25	45	27	46	51
Hispanic	49	29	57	31	46	48
Asian	69	66	75	61	73	67
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	75	75	75	75	75	75
America Indian/ Alaska Native	75	71	75	73	75	75
Two or more races	68	45	68	50	64	65

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state determines whether disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification by reviewing LEA Policies and Procedures (SP&P) relating to general education interventions, evaluation procedures, and initial eligibility for EBD, and by conducting onsite visits to evaluate the implementation of district policies, procedures, and practices. Based on review of district procedures and practices, the state concluded that the over-representation of black students in EBD is not the result of inappropriate identification.

OSEP Response

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2014, the State identified one or more districts with disproportionate representation. The measurement for this indicator requires that the State describe how the State made its annual determination, e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc., that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not provide that required description.

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate
Representations in Specific Disability
Categories**

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 11: Child Find

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		92.00%	93.10%	94.00%	96.87%	98.16%	98.81%	98.97%	99.04%	98.58%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
58,645	57,532	98.58%	100%	98.10%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1,113
---	-------

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

There were a total of 981 evaluations completed beyond the 60-day period:

1-10 days beyond = 373

11-20 days beyond = 205

21 or more days beyond = 403

Five districts reported a total of 132 evaluations that had not been completed by the evaluation timeline submission date of December 4, 2015. One district accounted for 113 of the incomplete evaluations. Delays were attributed to increased caseloads combined with staff attrition or illness, increase in the number of parent requests for evaluations, and difficulty obtaining all needed evaluation data within the timeline.

Statewide, the number of children with consent for an evaluation in 2014 increased by more than 4 percent compared to 2013.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations?

Initial evaluations must be completed within 60 school days that the student is in attendance after the school district's receipt of parental consent. For prekindergarten children, the initial evaluation must be completed within 60 school days after receipt of parental consent.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Districts log into a state database to enter the number of parental consents obtained and the number of evaluations completed within and beyond the evaluation timeframe. When the number of completed evaluations does not equal the number of parental consents obtained, the district must provide a brief explanation for the delay in completing the evaluation and the anticipated date for completion.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 11: Child Find
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: Child Find
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
31	31	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The state verifies that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) (i.e., 100 percent compliance) by requiring that each district with noncompliance randomly sample records of students initially evaluated in a given month during the 2014-15 school year. Districts continue to pull random samples until they are able to demonstrate 100 percent compliance with 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) in a given month. Results of random reviews (including student information, consent date, evaluation due date and evaluation completion date) are entered on the *Documentation of Correction of Noncompliance* and submitted to the State for verification of compliance.

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

The State verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance by requiring districts to submit the evaluation completion date for each evaluation completed after the district submission of 2013-14 data or by providing documentation that the student was exempt from the initial evaluation timeline (e.g., student left the district's jurisdiction prior to completion of the evaluation) for each student whose evaluation had not been completed when the district submitted the initial evaluation timeline data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		32.00%	68.50%	90.20%	99.20%	99.60%	99.80%	99.80%	99.85%	100%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	5,774
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	78
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	5,103
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.	195
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	398

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	5,103	5,103	100%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	0
--	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The FDOE and the Florida Department of Health (FDOH) Early Steps jointly provide data for this indicator. FDOH Early Steps provides data on Part C children referred to Part B. FDOE provides data from survey 5 and survey 2 from the student information database obtained from FDOE's Education Information and Accountability Services (EIAS) office.

The FDOE matches the data file from the FDOH Early Steps with survey 5 data files. Once survey 2 is available, the FDOE repeats the matching process. Finally, the FDOE unduplicates all matching records.

The FDOE sends districts the resulting data sets for review and data verification. Specifically, it asks districts to verify the child's enrollment in the district, dates of eligibility determination, eligibility status and IEP dates. Districts must code records for all children who are not located in the FDOE student information database or do not have eligibility/IEP dates on or before their third birthday.

Upon completion of the data review and verification process, districts return the final data sets to the FDOE for processing. The FDOE uses the final data sets to calculate indicator 12(a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). It calculates a final compliance percentage using the following formula: $[(c) \div (a - b - d - e)] \times 100$.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						82.30%	89.30%	90.90%	90.50%	88.77%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

FFY 2014 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
508	561	88.77%	100%	90.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2013

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
63	63	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							27.50%	28.00%	28.50%	29.00%
		Data						27.00%	27.50%	27.50%	26.60%	28.35%
B	2009	Target ≥							37.50%	38.00%	38.50%	42.00%
		Data						37.00%	38.60%	38.90%	38.30%	42.14%
C	2009	Target ≥							50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	54.00%
		Data						50.00%	51.00%	51.90%	50.40%	53.81%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	31.00%	33.00%	35.00%	37.00%	39.00%
Target B ≥	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Target C ≥	57.00%	60.00%	63.00%	66.00%	69.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	19474.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	5575.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2930.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	467.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1883.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	5575.00	19474.00	28.35%	31.00%	28.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	8505.00	19474.00	42.14%	44.00%	43.67%	Did Not Meet 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)	10855.00	19474.00	53.81%	57.00%	55.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Florida does not sample for Indicator 14 or use a survey procedure to collect data. The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) is used to search for all exiting students in postschool settings. Because all students are included in the FETPIP file, the data are complete and valid. More information about FETPIP may be found at <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/fl-edu-training-placement-info-program>.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			57.00%	57.50%	58.00%	58.50%	58.50%	59.50%	60.00%	55.00%
Data		57.00%	57.00%	69.00%	69.00%	63.90%	51.22%	52.94%	72.13%	59.09%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	72.50%	73.00%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see information provided in the introduction.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
FFY 2014 Data

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)))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	48	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	68	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
48	68	59.09%	72.50%	70.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			80.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	66.20%
Data		79.00%	71.00%	73.00%	73.00%	66.04%	63.93%	64.18%	65.28%	52.17%

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	68.20%	70.20%	72.20%	74.20%	75.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see information provided in the introduction.

Indicator 16: Mediation

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	9	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	21	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	54	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
9	21	54	52.17%	68.20%	55.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 16: Mediation
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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)))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		54.30%
Data	52.30%	55.06%

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

Explanation of Changes

See Indicator 1 for FFY2014 Data.

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	56.30%	58.30%	60.30%	62.30%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Description of Measure

Please see attachments.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see attachments.

Overview

Please see attachments.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Data Analysis

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

Please see attachments.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

Please see attachments.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

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

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

Statement

Please see attachments.

Description

Please see attachments.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Please see attachments.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Infrastructure Development

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

Please see attachments.

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

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

Please see attachments.

Evaluation

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

Please see attachments.

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Please see attachments.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Chief State School Officer

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: Monica Verra-Tirado

Title: State Special Education Director

Email: monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org

Phone: 850-245-0475