

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Georgia



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

During FFY 2019, Georgia experienced significant school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which required all students, including students with disabilities, to receive instruction virtually beginning mid-March through the duration of the 2019-2020 school year. While some local districts have reconvened face-to-face instruction, the devastating impact of COVID-19 has continued to present various challenges for data collections and annual performance reporting. As an example, Georgia will not report Indicator 3 assessment data because high stakes testing was not administered due to school closures. Despite the pandemic, the results outlined in Georgia's Annual Performance Report demonstrate a high degree of resilience and commitment for providing services for students with disabilities and building inclusive partnerships with families and communities. Georgia met targets for the following indicators: Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 8 (Parent Involvement), 9 (Disproportionate Representation), and 16 (Mediation). Georgia did not meet targets but had no slippage for the following indicators: Indicators 10 (Disproportionate Representation by Specific Eligibility Category), 11 (Child Find), 12 (Early Childhood Transition), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post-School Outcomes). Georgia had slippage in SPP/APR Indicators 4a (Significant Discrepancy), 4b (Significant Discrepancy), 7 (Preschool Outcomes), and 15 (Resolution Sessions).

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has been highly proactive in addressing the needs of students, teachers, leaders, and families during COVID-19 school closures. Since the beginning of COVID, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) has provided technical assistance and guidance for special education leaders, as well as, partnered with other divisions to address the needs of all leaders. On April 3, 2020, a technical assistance webinar (General Supervision and IDEA Implementation Technical Assistance - School Closures during COVID-19) was conducted with special education leaders at the Local Education Agency (LEA) level. Relevant guidance was provided on numerous topics such as virtual instruction, working with parents, documenting services, and FERPA adherence in a virtual environment. There was continual communication by DSESS with LEA leaders and the provision of resources. Resources were compiled and are available at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Sp%20Ed%20homepg/Special%20Education%20District%20Supports%20and%20COVID-19%20Resources.pdf>

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Georgia's performance data reporting was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic for Indicators 1, 2, and 4 because those indicators report lagging data. While Indicators 4a and 4b used lagging discipline data collected prior to the school closures, the State conducted the review of policies, practices, and procedures after March 2020. GaDOE allowed additional time for LEAs to complete the review of policies, procedures, and practices; however, the determinations of noncompliance were made by June 30, 2020.

Reporting for Indicators 5 and 6 were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic because GaDOE collected the indicator data prior to the COVID-19 school closures. GaDOE fully anticipates that these Indicators will be impacted by the FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report.

The State has continued to examine the impact of COVID-19 on other Indicators such as Indicators 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 to ensure accurate reporting and examine any causal relationship to slippage in this area. The discipline data used to Georgia extended the submission deadlines for LEAs to report data for Indicators 4a, 4b, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 to ultimately mitigate the impact of COVID-19 and ensure data completeness. For example, GaDOE allowed LEAs extra time to complete the review of policies, procedures, and practices for Indicators 9 and 10 similar to the explanation above for Indicators 4a and 4b.

Both Indicators 11 and 12 showed a significant decline in total requested initial evaluations and Part C referrals. The GaDOE reviewed this data and determined that COVID-19 directly impacted this area because of school closures. The number of signed parental consents for evaluation decreased by 8,060 for Indicator 11 and 1,223 for Indicator 12 from the prior SPP/APR. Georgia anticipates that the full impact of COVID-19 on Indicators 11 and 12 will continue to be represented for FFY 2020 Annual Performance Reports. Georgia's State Board of Education Rule 160-4-7-.04 EVALUATIONS AND REEVALUATIONS allows for timeline exceptions during holiday periods and other circumstances when children are not in attendance for five consecutive school days. During school closures, Georgia's Governor Kemp required all schools to close the physical buildings and refrain from face-to-face instruction. In some instances, LEAs continued to provide instruction for all students using remote/distance learning; however, Georgia's board rule allowed flexibility for LEAs to pause the 60-day timeline through the duration of the 2019-2020 school year. LEAs are working to complete all requested evaluations and will report on the completion of evaluations by which parent consents were obtained but impacted by state timeline pause for this period.

Data reliability, validity, and completeness were not noted for Indicator 3 because of the state testing waiver for the 2019-2020 administration.

The State reviewed data reliability and validity concerns for Indicator 7 (Preschool Outcomes) due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Preschool providers were restricted to using virtual observations to observe students in their natural environments to demonstrate acquisition of skills, social emotional skills, and behavioral skills. In addition to the reduced opportunity to collect additional data as prescribed, preschool providers were forced to provide virtual instruction for the duration of the 2019-2020 school year. In some instances, LEAs used instructional packets and asynchronous learning activities to address the instructional needs. The State attempted to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 by providing technical assistance and guidance to support continuity of learning for young children with disabilities.

LEAs experienced significant challenges during the pandemic; however, validity, reliability, and completeness were noted for all other APR Indicators to include 1, 2, 4a, 4b, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. Based on COVID-19, LEAS will continue to work through barriers for outcomes and results.

Georgia had slippage in SPP/APR Indicators 4a (Significant Discrepancy), 4b (Significant Discrepancy), 7 (Preschool Outcomes), and 15 (Resolution Sessions). Indicators 7 and 15 were adversely impacted by COVID-19 because of the inability to have face-to-face services and meetings. Preschool Outcomes were negatively impacted because the Child Outcome Summary (COS) utilized in determining the progress of children exiting preschool required teacher observations.

Indicator 15 (Resolution Sessions) was also significantly impacted by the COVID-19 school closures. An Executive Order from Governor Brian Kemp

closed all in-person instruction due to COVID-19 for the 2019-2020 school year beginning March 16, 2020, with all contact occurring virtually. Parents and school systems were extremely limited in their ability to pursue face-to-face Resolution Sessions. GaDOE was significantly limited in any attempt to mitigate the impact of COVID on this Indicator. Resolution Sessions can only involve the LEA and parent. GaDOE cannot be involved as a third party.

Indicators 4a and 4b had no COVID-19 impact and continue to be areas that Georgia is working aggressively to address through Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Monitoring of LEAs for noncompliance, Targeted Technical Assistance for LEAs, and direct support from the Results Driven Accountability Disproportionality team.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

216

General Supervision System

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

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

The DSESS provided appropriate accountability to ensure that LEAs complied with federal regulations. Fidelity of compliant practices was enforced by using a tiered monitoring system that enabled the Division staff to "monitor" all LEAs every year. The DSESS monitored each district every year through a tiered monitoring system to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the DSESS conducted a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. The State provided increased or more intensive supports based on the analysis of data. A critical component of Georgia's continuous improvement monitoring is the Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM), which is a four-year cycle. The CFM process is intensive and examines all components of a system's implementation of IDEA. The State monitors at least sixty LEAs each year.

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

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

Tier 3 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs and differentiated to meet their compliance and/or performance needs, which were triggered by the previous tier's data (i.e., Significant Disproportionality) or the CFM cycle.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any LEAs that demonstrated difficulty in timely correcting noncompliance.

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

Example of Monitoring Process-

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

Examples of Monitoring Activities for all SPP/APR indicators-

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

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

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

Data Verifications and Audits - DSESS selected a sampling of LEAs to provide data verification based on certain risk factors. In these instances, the LEAs provided appropriate documentation to support valid and accurate data reporting practice. This level of verification impacted a target group of LEAs.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) includes focused levels of support, such as the GaDOE directing root cause analysis and monitoring of Corrective Action Plan (CAP) development and correction. TTA may also include assistance with data analysis, improvement planning, identification of promising practices, training in identified needs, and other requests for resources that would facilitate program change. Successful TTA requires an ongoing negotiated and collaborative relationship. TTA leads to a purposeful, planned series of activities that result in changes to policy, program, or operations that support increased capacity at the state, LEA, and school levels. To achieve these outcomes, the collaboration often includes the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), local colleges and universities, and national partners to provide additional technical assistance to LEAs.

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

During FFY19, monthly Technical Assistance (TA) was provided to all LEAs through Monthly Special Education Directors Webinars which can be accessed at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Directors%27-Webinars.aspx>. The webinars provided timely information regarding topics such as Assistive Technology, English Learners and Students with Disabilities, IEP development, and Extended School Year Services.

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

The Collaborative Communities approach is another technical assistance model in which stakeholders are engaged in solving critical problems and supporting each other in their efforts. The Collaborative Communities are regularly scheduled (typically monthly) regional technical assistance meetings that all Georgia's LEAs may attend. Participants share common roles, responsibilities, and/or desired outcomes. They deepen their knowledge and expertise by sharing information, materials, and resources. These groups utilize focused action and shared leadership to work together to accomplish common goals.

Georgia has continued to strengthen its relationship with national Technical Assistance Centers including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), National Center for Educational Outcome (NCEO), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). Tools and resources available from IDC are used to assist in data analysis. Georgia has also collaborated with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services.

Professional Development System

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

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

Georgia's State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) houses longitudinal information on student attendance, assessment information, and grades. SLDS also contains the Professional Learning Opportunities Platform, which has greatly enhanced virtual learning opportunities for LEA district and school-level personnel. There are multiple modules on the platform that provide information about effectively writing IEPs and using the GO-IEP program. There are also numerous instructional provision presentations available on the platform.

The Division of Special Education Services collaborated with many partners at the national, regional, state, and local levels to provide timely and accurate information about available professional development in special education. These collaborations often include the national technical assistance centers, the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), and local colleges and universities. The Division's professional development incorporates many factors, including the model and delivery method (job-related or job-embedded) that will be followed and the type of training. In addition, professional development is generally self-directed, based on previous experience, relevant to the needs, and applicable to the specific situation. It is based on data that answers the question "who needs to know what" at the district, administrative, school, or specialist's level. The various delivery models for professional development include webinars, training module series, videos, and face to face conferencing. Some examples of these can be found at:

- [Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx)
- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Professional Development Videos: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Personnel-Development-Grant.aspx>
- GaDOE Special Education Professional Learning Resources: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-.aspx>

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

The GaDOE provides data regarding students with disabilities in our state. The Annual Performance Report is posted on the Special Education webpage at the following link: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and previous years. LEA public Annual Performance Reports are available for public viewing using the following link: https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html. The user must enter the zip code for the LEA or type the name of the LEA that you are interested in viewing.

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

Data for Indicators 1 and 2 are not publicly reported by LEAs as lagging data since Georgia has access to this information earlier than required for SPP/APR. For example, the FFY2019 data for Indicators 1 and 2 are reported on Georgia's Annual Performance Report for the 2018-2019 school year.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

GaDOE is currently working with ten targeted LEAs to collect and analyze the outcomes of the FFY19 SSIP activities to accomplish the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) targets. They are collecting progress monitoring on all implemented evidence-based interventions and measuring each LEA's implementation fidelity of key improvement activities. The SSIP team is very pleased with the current progress despite the ongoing opportunities due to the pandemic. LEAs and schools are committed to providing robust and rigorous instruction while showing compassion and building relationships that promote student success. All measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission will be reported in the FFY2019 SPP/APR SSIP report submitted on or before April 1, 2021. The State will be utilizing the SSIP template provided by OSEP to capture the summary and data that demonstrates implementation activities that are impacting the State's capacity to improve the SiMR data.

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	35.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	53.20%	54.00%	54.50%	57.60%	57.58%
Data	36.50%	54.33%	56.59%	56.27%	61.11%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	62.27%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by

the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Georgia received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan, which included targets for graduation for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committee. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students. Georgia's methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR was the same methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The baseline and the formula for the ESSA plan were the same as used for the SPP/APR with the only difference being the denominator for the SPP/APR is only SWDs. Georgia utilized an ambitious approach to setting ESSA goals for high school graduation rates. The expectation is for all schools to continue to make improvements and decrease gaps. Under the ESSA, Georgia created a new target structure in which growth or maintenance of high achievement levels was expected of all schools and all subgroups. The goal was to incentivize continuous, sustainable improvement. The State calculated graduation rate improvement targets, defined as 3% of the gap between 2017 data as the baseline and 100%. The 3% improvement target aligns with Georgia's robust system of state accountability.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	9,685
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	15,388
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	62.94%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
9,685	15,388	61.11%	62.27%	62.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

4-year ACGR

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

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

Georgia is reporting data from the 2018-2019 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), the adjusted cohort graduation rate.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data completeness, validity, and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. This is a lagging indicator and provides data on the 2018-2019 school year.

On November 21, 2019, GaDOE received the approval for a waiver to permit the State to include in the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an alternate assessment based upon alternate achievement standards (AA-AAAS) and who would otherwise meet the definition for a State-defined Alternate Diploma. The waiver allows Georgia to report students assessed with the alternate assessment who meet the alternate criteria for a diploma in the numerator of the graduation rate calculation as regular diploma graduates.

Georgia amended its Graduation Rule to adopt an Alternate Diploma that meets the requirements in ESEA sections 8101(23)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) and 8101(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb). This amendment was adopted on February 20, 2020, and became effective on March 11, 2020. The Alternate Diploma option is available to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take Georgia's AA-AAAS and who enter high school in the 2020-2021 school year. Georgia plans to apply for an extension to the waiver for future graduation rate calculations.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	6.10%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	5.90%	5.80%	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%
Data	5.90%	5.60%	5.60%	5.74%	5.47%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	5.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	10,347
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	416
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	3,321
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	49

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

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,555	69,234	5.47%	5.40%	5.13%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data completeness, validity and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. This is a lagging indicator and provides data on the 2018-2019 school year.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2011	Target >=	98.40%	98.45%	98.45%	98.50%	98.75%
A	Overall	98.70%	Actual	98.18%	99.14%	99.13%	98.89%	98.25%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2011	Target >=	97.70%	97.75%	97.75%	97.80%	98.25%
A	Overall	98.00%	Actual	97.10%	99.43%	98.83%	98.56%	97.88%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.75%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			98.25%	98.75%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			97.88%	98.25%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Elementary/Middle	X	X	X	X	X	X					
B	HS							X	X	X	X	

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Elementary/Middle	2016	Target >=	16.77%	16.87%	17.66%	20.13%	20.92%
A	Elementary/Middle	17.66%	Actual	16.77%	16.89%	17.66%	18.45%	17.76%
B	HS	2016	Target >=	12.28%	12.30%	15.73%	18.25%	22.75%
B	HS	15.73%	Actual	12.28%	13.34%	15.73%	20.22%	17.30%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Elementary/Middle	2016	Target >=	15.42%	15.90%	19.97%	22.37%	24.03%
A	Elementary/Middle	19.97%	Actual	15.42%	19.14%	19.97%	21.63%	19.82%
B	HS	2016	Target >=	11.07%	11.57%	11.59%	14.25%	16.52%
B	HS	11.59%	Actual	11.07%	12.51%	11.59%	13.87%	13.07%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary/Middle	20.23%
Reading	B >=	HS	19.83%
Math	A >=	Elementary/Middle	22.21%

Math	B >=	HS	16.12%
------	------	----	--------

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary/Middle			17.76%	20.23%		N/A	N/A
B	HS			17.30%	19.83%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary/Middle			19.82%	22.21%		N/A	N/A
B	HS			13.07%	16.12%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with

disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	18.52%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.40%	18.52%	17.50%	16.50%	15.50%
Data	2.53%	18.52%	18.52%	57.14%	11.76%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	15.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

198

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5	14	11.76%	15.50%	35.71%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

While Georgia demonstrated slippage for Indicator 4a, the State has made tremendous progress decreasing removals for all students to include students with disabilities. As you will note above, 198 districts were excluded from the calculation based on either the n-size or the cell size. In many instances, LEAs did not demonstrate enough students removed greater than 10 days and did not meet the minimum cell size, which is a positive trend. During the FFY 2018 APR, Georgia reported 2 out of 17 LEAs as having significant discrepancy as compared to 5 out of 14 LEAs during the FFY 2019 APR. The total number of LEAs included in the calculation declined, but the number of LEAs demonstrating significant discrepancy increased from the previous year.

After further review, GaDOE noted opportunities for improvement to address fidelity for data collections and reporting for several LEAs. The State has continued to review its updated procedures and practices to ensure that evidence-based practices are being implemented to reduce removals, as well as, general supervision procedures are being completed to ensure accurate data reporting. LEAs received Technical Assistance regarding Data Collection reports that allow local leaders to analyze discipline data in real-time in their Student Information System (SIS) platform. Ongoing review of discipline data allows building and system-level leaders to identify students who are at risk of excessive use of suspensions. The review also enables LEA leaders to correct data reporting errors before the required student record data collections.

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy is defined as the percentage 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 (District SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days) AND 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 and supports, and procedural safeguards. The district threshold score is a rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for 2 consecutive years. Methodology: The percentage of districts with a significant discrepancy was determined using calculations only for districts that had at least 30 children with disabilities (n size) and ≥ 10 students with disabilities suspended Out of School (OSS) >10 days (cell size). There were 14 districts that met both criteria. Of the 14 systems included for analysis, there were 5 that met the rate ratio of ≥ 2.0 for two consecutive years. There were 4 of the 5 discrepant systems determined to have 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 and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The calculation used the n and cell size requirements. Data completeness, validity and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. This is a lagging indicator and provides data on the 2018-2019 school year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

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

GaDOE provided the review of policies, procedures, and practices by examining written procedures and practices related to this area to ensure that all IDEA requirements are included in the LEA written policies. The review was conducted for all LEAs who met the criteria of 2 consecutive years of significant discrepancy (Rate Ratio >=2.0). This review includes topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As an example, the State reviewed documentation to determine the following:

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

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

If YES, select one of the following:

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

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

The State ensured that after completing the review, each LEA with noncompliance was appropriately notified and advised of next steps. As appropriate, the LEA may be required to revise its policies, procedures, and practices. For LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and are required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of official notification. In addition, the State provided technical assistance for LEAs using webinars about implementing effective practices and developing effective CAPs. The State required the LEAs to correct individual instances of noncompliance and submit updated data after revising practices to comply with Prong 1 and Prong 2 correction. In Prong 1, the LEAs corrected each individual instance of noncompliance. In Prong 2, the LEAs demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance in this area. This monitoring protocol included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. Prong 2 included a review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction, which demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the State's review of updated data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State identified two districts with significant discrepancy. The State required the two districts to convene district level teams to complete the Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports or procedural safeguards. The noncompliant districts demonstrated noncompliant practices as they related to the following areas: (1) Development and implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), (2) Appropriate use of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and (3) Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

In addition the State ensured noncompliance was corrected by providing technical assistance to the LEAs, monitoring and approving their CAP, and held scheduled communication with the LEAs to verify improvement, as well as providing professional development and ensuring the professional development was provided to appropriate staff of the LEA.

In addition, a Prong 2 review of data determined if systemic change and improvement occurred in systems identified with noncompliance. This monitoring protocol included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review reflected compliant practices and procedures. Prong 2 demonstrated that the LEA is implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the State's review of updated data.

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

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

The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008. The noncompliant data was required to be addressed, with evidence of correction of noncompliance submitted to state staff for their verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA Prong 1 data came into compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	5.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.52%	0.00%	5.00%	18.18%	15.38%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

198

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
8	4	14	15.38%	0%	28.57%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

While Georgia demonstrated slippage for Indicator 4b, the State has made tremendous progress decreasing removals for all students to include students with disabilities. As you will note above, 198 districts were excluded from the calculation based on either the n-size or the cell size. In many instances, LEAs did not demonstrate enough students removed greater than 10 days and did not meet the minimum cell size, which is a positive trend.

After further review, GaDOE noted opportunities for improvement to address fidelity for data collections and reporting for several LEAs. The State has continued to review its updated procedures and practices to ensure that evidence-based practices are being implemented to reduce removals, as well as, general supervision procedures are being completed to ensure accurate data reporting. LEAs received Technical Assistance regarding Data Collection reports that allow local leaders to analyze discipline data in real-time in their Student Information System (SIS) platform. Ongoing review of discipline data allows building and system-level leaders to identify students who are at risk of excessive use of suspensions. The review also enables LEA leaders to correct data reporting errors before the required student record data collections.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity is defined as the percentage 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 (District SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days) AND 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 and supports, and procedural safeguards. Methodology: The percentage of districts with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity was determined using significant discrepancy calculations only for districts that had at least one ethnic or racial subgroup with 30 children with disabilities (n size) and at least one subgroup >= 10 students with disabilities suspended Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup (cell size)) . After removing these systems, there were 14 districts that remained and comprised the denominator. Of the systems evaluated, 8 met the rate ratio of >= 2.0 for two consecutive years, and 4 of those were determined to have 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 and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data was calculated using the n and cell size. Data completeness, validity and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. This is a lagging indicator and provides data on the 2018-2019 school year.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

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

The State provided the review of policies, procedures, and practices by examining written procedures and practices related to this area to ensure that all IDEA requirements are included in the LEA written policies. This includes topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As examples, the State reviews to determine information such as :

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

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

If YES, select one of the following:

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

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

The State ensured that after completing the review, each LEA with noncompliance was appropriately notified and advised of the next steps. As appropriate, the LEA was required to revise its policies, procedures, and practices. For LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of official notification. In addition, the State offered technical support to districts through webinars about implementing effective practices and developing effective CAPs. The State required the LEA to correct individual instances of noncompliance and submit updated data after revising practices to comply with Prong 1 and Prong 2 correction. In Prong 1, the LEAs corrected each individual instance of noncompliance. In Prong 2, the State provided a review of systemic corrections and improvement. This monitoring protocol included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review reflected compliant practices and procedures. Prong 2 demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the State's review of updated data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State ensured that after completing the review, each LEA with noncompliance was appropriately notified and advised of the next steps. As appropriate, the LEA may be required to revise its policies, procedures, and practices. For LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and are required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of official notification. In addition, the State provided technical assistance for LEAs using webinars about implementing effective practices and developing effective CAPs. The State required the LEAs to correct individual instances of noncompliance and submit updated data after revising practices to comply with Prong 1 and Prong 2 correction. In Prong 1, the LEAs corrected each individual instance of noncompliance. In Prong 2, the LEAs demonstrated systemic correction of noncompliance in this area. This monitoring protocol included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. Prong 2 included a review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction, which demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the State's review of updated data.

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

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

The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008. The noncompliant data were required to be addressed, with evidence of correction of noncompliance submitted to state staff for their verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance and that the LEA showed systemic improvement by their sampling of similar student data being compliant.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	65.10%	65.20%	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%
A	62.73%	Data	64.87%	64.89%	64.46%	64.06%	63.04%
B	2019	Target <=	14.40%	14.30%	14.20%	14.10%	14.00%
B	16.58%	Data	14.56%	15.04%	15.11%	15.20%	16.26%
C	2019	Target <=	1.80%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.38%
C	1.48%	Data	2.13%	2.07%	1.97%	1.77%	1.54%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	
Target B <=	
Target C <=	

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	214,339
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	134,463
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	35,544
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,342
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	346
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	483

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

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	134,463	214,339	63.04%		62.73%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	35,544	214,339	16.26%		16.58%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,171	214,339	1.54%		1.48%	N/A	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data completeness, validity and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. Data was collected in October 2019 prior to the pandemic. Georgia is establishing a new baseline in this year's SPP/APR due to a change in children included in Indicators 5 and 6. Beginning with the data collection for the 2019-2020 school year, in alignment with OSEP guidance, Georgia now includes 5-year-old children in K in Indicator 5 instead of 6. Five-year-old children in pre-k continue to be included in indicator 6. Indicator 5 has not been impacted by the change as much as Indicator 6 because the percent of students added to Indicator 5 is much smaller than the percent of students removed from Indicator 6. However, both Indicators show differences in data attributable to the collection change that should be reflected by new baselines.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	45.80%	46.00%	46.20%	46.40%	46.60%
A	32.54%	Data	44.22%	43.98%	42.95%	41.94%	41.76%
B	2019	Target <=	24.00%	23.00%	23.50%	23.00%	22.50%
B	41.32%	Data	24.07%	24.65%	25.82%	27.44%	29.26%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	
Target B <=	

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	11,271
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	3,668
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,622
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	35
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

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

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	3,668	11,271	41.76%		32.54%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,657	11,271	29.26%		41.32%	N/A	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data completeness, validity and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. Data was collected in October 2019 prior to the pandemic.

Georgia is establishing a new baseline in this year's SPP/APR due to a change in children included in Indicators 5 and 6. Beginning with the data collection for the 2019-2020 school year, in alignment with OSEP guidance, Georgia now includes 5-year-old children in Indicator 5 instead of 6. Five-year-old children in pre-k continue to be included in indicator 6. Indicator 5 has not been impacted by the change as much as Indicator 6 because the percentage of students added to Indicator 5 is much smaller than the percentage of student removed from Indicator 6. However, both Indicators show differences in data attributable to the collection change that should be reflected by new baselines.

The number of students in the Indicator 6 collection have significantly decreased with the removal of 5-year-old K students. Georgia is fortunate to have a Lottery funded pre-k program for 4-year-old children, but this is not universally available to all students. Many students with disabilities are served

through this program, and many pre-K students' needs are met through services provided in the home or other community settings. The needs of other pre-k students are met by services provided in separate early childhood special education programs.

There is a decrease in the total number of students in Indicator 6, and an increase in more restrictive placements. Students who previously would have been in 6A (5-year-old students in K) are now in Indicator 5. As a result, Environment 6A has decreased and 6B has increased.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target >=	78.40%	78.50%	78.50%	78.60%	78.60%
A1	68.70%	Data	80.63%	80.32%	78.46%	79.75%	80.53%
A2	2008	Target >=	61.50%	61.60%	61.70%	61.80%	62.00%

A2	57.10%	Data	61.00%	65.58%	64.30%	62.01%	62.16%
B1	2008	Target >=	81.10%	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%
B1	63.90%	Data	84.25%	83.05%	82.49%	82.58%	83.38%
B2	2008	Target >=	36.90%	37.00%	37.10%	37.20%	37.30%
B2	24.90%	Data	42.43%	48.53%	48.62%	47.44%	48.08%
C1	2008	Target >=	77.50%	77.70%	77.90%	78.00%	78.00%
C1	71.20%	Data	81.27%	80.43%	78.55%	79.74%	80.56%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.50%	71.70%	71.90%	72.00%	72.00%
C2	65.70%	Data	70.91%	74.85%	81.58%	71.04%	71.60%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	80.00%
Target A2 >=	62.00%
Target B1 >=	82.00%
Target B2 >=	45.00%
Target C1 >=	80.00%
Target C2 >=	72.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

7,271

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	128	1.76%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	869	11.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,285	31.43%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,836	25.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,153	29.61%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,121	5,118	80.53%	80.00%	80.52%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,989	7,271	62.16%	62.00%	54.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	158	2.17%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	977	13.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,912	40.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,314	31.83%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	910	12.52%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,226	6,361	83.38%	82.00%	82.16%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the	3,224	7,271	48.08%	45.00%	44.34%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	150	2.06%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	718	9.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,676	23.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,814	24.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,913	40.06%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	3,490	4,358	80.56%	80.00%	80.08%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	4,727	7,271	71.60%	72.00%	65.01%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Students did not receive in-person instruction from the middle of March through the end of the school year due to COVID-19. As a result, early childhood outcomes were adversely impacted and slippage occurred. Teachers did not have an opportunity to directly observe students for over two months, which made it difficult to determine the full capabilities of the students. In the months of March, April, and May of 2019-2020 all instruction and observation for this group was virtual due to Executive Order of Governor Brian Kemp beginning on March 16, 2020. This age group was very challenging to serve virtually and required parental involvement. Many parents opted not to participate in this virtual instruction. In these cases, the most current data prior to the end of in-person instruction was used. Pre-K providers had difficulty determining if students were functioning within age expectation for students exiting pre-k or turning six on the COS.
B2	Students did not receive in-person instruction from the middle of March through the end of the school year due to COVID-19. As a result, early childhood outcomes were adversely impacted and slippage occurred. Teachers did not have an opportunity to directly observe students for over two months, which made it difficult to determine the full capabilities of the students. In the months of March, April, and May of 2019-2020 all instruction and observation for this group was virtual due to Executive Order of Governor Brian Kemp beginning on March 16, 2020. This age group was very challenging to serve virtually and required parental involvement. Many parents opted not to participate in this virtual instruction. In these cases, the most current data prior to the end of in person instruction was used. Pre-K providers had difficulty determining if students were functioning within age expectation for students exiting pre-k or turning six on the COS.
C2	Students did not receive in person instruction from the middle of March through the end of the school year due to COVID-19. As a result, early childhood outcomes were adversely impacted and slippage occurred. Teachers did not have an opportunity to directly observe students for over two months, which made it difficult to determine the full capabilities of the students. In the months of March, April, and May of 2019-2020 all instruction and observation for this group was virtual due to Executive Order of Governor Brian Kemp beginning on March 16, 2020. This age group was very challenging to serve virtually and required parental involvement. Many parents opted not to participate in this virtual instruction. In these cases, the most current data prior to the end of in-person instruction was used. Pre-K providers had difficulty determining if students were functioning within age expectation for students exiting pre-k or turning six on the COS.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

To provide guidance to the LEAs, the State created a Task Force to study how these data were collected. In addition, GaDOE Special Education leadership has received input from the State Advisory Panel and other stakeholders to guide this work. A spreadsheet is provided to Special Education Directors to enter their student-level data. The following information is entered for each preschool student: Student Name, Date of Birth, Program Entry Date, Age of Entry, Entrance Rating, Duration of Service and Exit Rating. Once the information is entered, the spreadsheet calculates the ratings for each of the three Preschool Outcomes. Data are reported for children who have been in the preschool program for at least six months and exit the program to Kindergarten or turn six years old. Special Education Directors report these data in the Preschool Outcomes Application in the GaDOE portal. The summary statements are automatically calculated for each outcome.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data completeness, validity, and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19. Students did not receive in-person instruction from the middle of March through the end of the school year due to COVID-19. Teachers did not have an opportunity to directly observe students for over two months, which made it difficult to determine the full capabilities of the students using the Childhood Outcomes Survey. Preschoolers were very challenging to serve virtually and required parental involvement. As a result, early childhood outcomes were adversely impacted and slippage occurred. Georgia tried to mitigate the impact on data collection by extending the window for LEAs to report data to the State from June to September 30, 2020.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.50%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	44.50%	45.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Data	46.00%	49.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
21,675	24,492	73.00%		88.50%	N/A	N/A

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

0

Percentage of respondent parents

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

During the 2019-2020 school year, Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirement. All families of children with disabilities had the opportunity to participate in the survey, including parents of preschool students. Parents were all offered the same survey regardless of the grade level of the student allowing the analysis procedures to be valid and reliable. Paper copies were also available upon request. Georgia began using the online survey during the 2016-2017 school year. In prior years Georgia used a sampling methodology which placed some of our schools on a 5-year rotation for participation, not affording all parents the opportunity to participate. Georgia did not report the number of surveys distributed in 19-20 because no distribution takes place. The survey is available for participation online to all parents of children with disabilities age 3-21 in Georgia. The survey is publicized by each school system and the GaDOE so that all parents of children with disabilities including parents of children in preschool may respond to the survey. The data from the parents of preschool children is included with the data reported for all parent responses.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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

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

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

These data reveal that a higher percentage of parents of White SWD responded to the survey (47.47%) compared to the percentage of White SWD enrolled (39.8%). A lower percentage of parents of Black (31.66%) and Hispanic (11.44%) SWD responded to the survey as compared to Black (39.3%) and Hispanic (15.4%) SWD enrolled. However, participation is improved from the prior year in these demographic groups. Five hundred and fifty-five (2.27%) respondents did not report their race/ethnicity category when responding to the survey.

Georgia has increased efforts to increase the representativeness of survey respondents. The Georgia Department of Education and LEAs publicize the availability of the survey to all families. LEA data have been shared with each Special Education Director. SEA staff and Parent Mentors have worked and will continue to work with Special Education Directors to provide strategies for increasing participation in the survey in FFY20 across all demographic groups. SEA staff will analyze the real time data of surveys completed in the current year and contact Special Education Directors to examine their data which is available in the Special Education Dashboard by school. The demographic data are not provided to Special Education Directors to avoid identifying the parents who respond. However, the directors may view the number of responses by school and are knowledgeable about the demographic makeup of each school. The SEA staff will encourage directors to reach out to system-level and school leaders to increase awareness and importance of the survey, publicize the survey at school events, and provide technology for survey completion at events and meetings.

The state level disability area data collected in FFY 2019 show that the percentage of responses were slightly higher from parents of children with Autism (5.28% higher than demographic group); the percentage of responses were lower from parents of children with Other Health Impairment (5.69% less than the demographic group) and Specific Learning Disability (20.49% less than the demographic group); responses were commensurate for all other areas of disability (less than 2% difference). Two thousand three hundred ninety-one (9.76%) respondents did not designate the disability category of their child. The data was increased in variance in representation by disability. Specific Learning Disability increased underrepresentation by approximately 10%. The number of parents who did not identify a disability increased by approximately 4%. The survey is anonymously completed by parents and the disability category may not be correctly designated or may reflect secondary or tertiary disabilities rather than the primary disability. In addition, as reflected by the increase in parents who did not identify a disability, parents may not always be aware of the specific disability designation.

Georgia's percentage of parents reporting their schools facilitated parental involvement in FFY19 rose to 88.5% from 73% in the FFY18 collection. The number of valid responses increased from 22,028 in FFY2018 to 24,492 in FFY2019. The methodology used by Georgia for the measuring Indicator 8 is an online survey available to all parents of SWD in Georgia; therefore, a number of surveys distributed cannot be reported.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia is establishing a new baseline in this year's SPP/APR due to a change in the calculation of the parental involvement rating as measured by the Parent Survey. The Parent Survey content remains unchanged. The Parent Survey has 10 questions to which parents can respond with one of the following responses to each item: Very Strongly Agree, Strongly Agree, Agree, Very Strongly Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Disagree. Previous calculations of the percentage of parental involvement only included parental responses of Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree. Feedback from stakeholders and family engagement personnel indicated that Agree should be added to Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree as indicating favorable parental involvement. As a result, the calculations for the current report also included ratings of Agree as indicating that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The inclusion of this additional response and the overall increase in participation yielded a higher favorability percentage for Indicator 8.

Parent Survey indicator data completeness, validity, and reliability were not impacted by COVID-19, because it was online and available. The State extended the collection time period for the surveys to mitigate the impact of COVID-19.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

Georgia has examined the representativeness of the response group of the demographics of children receiving special education as indicated in the section titled "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services". Georgia examined the representativeness of the parents responding to the Parent Survey based upon the percentages of students served by race/ethnicity. In examining variance, Georgia used a band of + or - 5% in parental response rate based upon racial/ethnic representation of students receiving special education services. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup, a representative rate of response would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents. Georgia also indicated the steps being taken to address the issue. The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and provide information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization. Training from the GaDOE will focus on the importance of high participation and use of the parent survey. Strategies will be shared to encourage high participation and participation representative of the student enrollment. Strategies include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

9

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	207	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian, or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria at the school system level: (1) Risk Ratio ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Subgroup ≥ 10 . Georgia has a minimum cell size of 10. Georgia has a minimum n-size of 30. Only school systems that meet both criteria are evaluated at the school system level for disproportionality by the State.

Methodology: Only school systems with at least 30 students enrolled in a specific racial/ethnic category at the school system level are included in the analysis. After filtering for this criteria, 207 systems were included in the denominator. For inclusion in the numerator, a system had to have an enrollment of ≥ 10 SWD students in the district in the same racial/ethnic categories. There were no systems that had a risk ratio of ≥ 3.0 .

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

Georgia identifies LEAs as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any LEA that has a Risk Ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years for identification as a student with disabilities receiving special education and related services in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation, reevaluation, and eligibility determination processes. LEAs whose data demonstrate that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, procedures, and practices. The State ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the LEA is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, reliability, and validity of this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19.

Georgia has consistently had 0% of systems that met the criteria for state-level analysis and inclusion in the SPP/APR percentage, with the exception of 2017 with a percentage of 0.48.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	8.29%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.98%	11.27%	8.29%	2.90%	5.61%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

18

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
35	7	198	5.61%	0%	3.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Georgia defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in the special education categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impaired, Speech Language Impaired, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Emotional Behavioral Disorders by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio >= 3.0 for two consecutive years {FFY 2018 >= 3.0 and FFY 2019 >= 3.0} and (2) SWD Subgroup = 10 (minimum cell size). Methodology: Only school systems with at least 30 students in one ethnic/racial category at the system level are included in the analysis. After filtering for this criteria, 198 systems were included in the denominator. For inclusion in the numerator, a system had to have 10 students in one of the specified eligibility categories in one racial/ethnic category and an enrollment of 30 students in the district in the same ethnic/racial categories. There were 35 systems that met the threshold level with a risk ratio of >= 3.0.

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

Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addressed the following areas: child find, evaluation, reevaluations, and eligibility determination processes. LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures, and the GaDOE ultimately determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. If determined to have noncompliance, the LEA developed Corrective Action Plans within 45 days of the determination and demonstrated timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, 7 of the 35 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These LEAs developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GaDOE staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, reliability, and validity of the data for this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19. The narrative of the initial submission of this document indicated that the age range for data collection for this indicator was 3-21. That was not accurate. The age range for the data collection was that specified in the Measurement Table, ages 6-21. The initial statement indicating an age range of 3-21 was made in error by the new data manager in confusion with the significant disproportionality calculation requirements. After the receipt of OSEP feedback, verification was made that the calculation of Disproportionate Representation was accurately made as reported in this SPP/APR. The data is valid as reported.

A new baseline was not set as the calculation reflected the 6-21 age group and not a 5K through 21 age group. The 5K through 21 calculation will be implemented with the next SPP/APR submission and a new baseline will be set.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11		0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the eleven districts showing noncompliance, the State determined that all LEAs with findings of noncompliance were corrected in FFY 2018 through verification of correction of those findings consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The LEAs were required to correct individual instances of noncompliance. In examining systemic change for alignment with regulatory guidance, the LEAs with identified noncompliance were asked to submit for review, by the State, a sampling of eligibility reports developed since the noncompliance determination and after the provision of technical assistance as described in the paragraph below. Policies, practices, and procedures of LEAs were also reviewed and brought into alignment with regulatory guidance. The eligibility reports had to show evidence of correction of noncompliance for verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEAs showed systemic correction and were 100% compliant. The State verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieved 100% compliance based upon a review of updated data. The data (eligibility reports) was collected through Special Education Applications, the State's special education data collection system.

The State provided technical assistance to LEAs through teleconferences and webinars to provide support for the correction of noncompliance. Topics of

this technical assistance included: requirements for eligibility categories, effective prereferral interventions, and eligibility process in totality. As a part of the process, the State convened a team to review a new sample of eligibility reports for compliant practices based on the evaluation and eligibility rules. The new sampling from LEAs demonstrated compliant practices. After reviewing the sampling, the State provided additional feedback on the LEAs; progress and held teleconferences with the LEAs to share the findings. As indicated in the prior section, each LEA achieved 100% compliance.

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

In FFY 2018, 11 LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All 11 LEAs received written notification of noncompliance with specific provisions of the Part B regulations by June 30, 2019. All 11 LEAs corrected the noncompliance within one year of written notification. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA. The State: (1) required the school system to change policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each school system was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the school system, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the seven districts identified in FFY 2019 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.42%	98.80%	98.56%	97.91%	98.54%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
27,440	27,112	98.54%	100%	98.80%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

328

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

Georgia had 328 students whose evaluation was not completed within the required 60 days.

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

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

Evaluation completed 1 -10 days after 60 days: 125

Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days: 81

Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days: 45

Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days: 77

The number of students for each reason for delay is shown below:

Student delay (excessive absences, withdrawal, re-enrollment): 24 (7.3%)

Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner): 23 (7%)

Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists): 232 (70.7%)

District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures): 35 (10.7%)

Other reasons such as school closure due to weather: 14 (4.3%)

Total Late: 328 (100%)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A spreadsheet was provided for LEAs to use that tracked the number of referrals completed on time, eligibility determination of the referrals (eligible or not eligible), if late, the number of days late, and the reasons late. For LEAs that opted to use the State-Provided IEP platform, this information was generated within the IEP Platform. Special Education Directors submitted the data by September 30th each year for the previous fiscal year. The data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year.

The GaDOE reviewed the Child Find data of each LEA to ensure timely initial evaluations. Georgia has a 60-day requirement for receipt of consent to the completion of the evaluation. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance.

Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area. Those LEAs not at 100% must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance.

The GaDOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. The verification process ensures timeline data are accurate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The validity and reliability of this indicator were not impacted. The completeness of this indicator was not impacted; however, LEAs reported a reduced number of requests for initial evaluations based in the flexibility to pause the 60-day timeline per State Board of Education Rule. Georgia attempted to mitigate the impact on data collection by extending the timeframe for LEAs to report their data to the State. Although the timeframe for collection remained in the July 1- June 30 window, LEAs had until September 30, 2020, to submit data.

The impact on Child Find was not what would be expected based on COVID-19. Specifically, a significant decline in on-time evaluations would be expected with the closure of in-person instruction in schools beginning March 16, 2020, based upon the Executive Order of Governor Brian Kemp in Georgia. However, a closer examination of the data indicates the probable explanation for stability in the percentage of evaluations completed and reported in prior SPP/APRs. The number of signed parental consents for evaluation decreased by 7,060 in the FFY 19 school year. The decline in received consents for evaluation is due to several factors: 1) Parents would not provide consent because they did not want an evaluation completed with the risk of COVID-19. 2) Data collection for progress monitoring for initial referrals was very difficult to complete virtually, making it difficult to complete referrals and request parental consent.

The Georgia timeframe rules reflect the following exceptions for exclusion from the 60-day timeframe: 1) The parent of the child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation. (2) A child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. (3) Georgia Exception - Extenuating Circumstance. An Extenuating Circumstance would be an event beyond the LEAs control such as a hurricane, tornado, snowstorm, or pandemic. If one of these exceptions is applicable, the student is not included in the timeframe calculations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
520	520		0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the districts identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications- Dashboard. LEAs maintain a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors

to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities completed between July 1 and October 31 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. Based on the review of information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 made necessary changes and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Additionally, each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the Special Education Applications- Dashboard.

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

For FFY2018, LEAs not at 100% compliant had to complete Prong 1 activities.

Prong 1 required Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. This addressed the isolated findings of non-compliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each student who exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, Georgia's State Board of Education Rule 160-4-7-.04 "allowed flexibility for LEAs to pause the 60-day timeline through the duration of the 2019-2020 school year. LEAs are working to complete all requested evaluations and will report on the completion of evaluations by which parent consents were obtained but impacted by state timeline pause for this period."

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.21%	99.75%	99.52%	98.98%	98.40%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,546
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	613

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,836
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.	18
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	33
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	2,836	2,882	98.40%	100%	98.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
46

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

In FFY2019 Georgia reported 46 students whose IEPs were not in place by the 3rd birthday. The following data describes the number of days late and the reasons late.

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

1 - 10 days: 19 students

11 - 30 days: 4 students

31 - 60 days: 8 students

> 60 days: 15 students

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

Student delay: 1 student (2.17%)

Parent delay: 11 students (23.9%)

Teacher/evaluator delay: 25 students (54.3%)

System errors: 0 students (0%)

Other (school closure due to weather): 9 students (19.6%)

Total Late: 46 (100%)

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. A spreadsheet was provided for the LEA to use which tracked the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the 3 birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submitted the data by July 31st typically. The submission date was moved to September 30, 2020, due to COVID-19 this year. Georgia is likely to continue to complete the collection at this later date to obtain the most comprehensive and complete data. The data are submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year.

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The validity and reliability of this indicator were not impacted. The completeness of this indicator may have been impacted by COVID-19 as indicated below. Georgia attempted to mitigate the impact on data collection by extending the timeframe for LEAs to report their data to the State. Although the timeframe for collection remained in the July 1- June 30 window, LEAs had until September 30, 2020 to submit data to the State..

The impact on Early Childhood Transition was not what would be expected based on COVID-19. Specifically, a significant decline in on-time evaluations would be expected. However, a closer examination of the data indicates the probable explanation for stability in the percentage of evaluations completed. The number of signed parental consents for evaluation decreased by 1,223 in the FFY 19 school year. The decline in referrals to Part B from Part C is likely a by-product of COVID-19. The families of very young children identified as eligible for Part C, were likely hesitant to proceed with moving forward toward Part B transition. This may have been due to the nature of the services that would be available after completing the transition at that time. Meaningful virtual instruction for preschool children has been particularly challenging. Lottery funded pre-k programs in the public schools were not open for in-person instruction for young children and community daycare centers were largely closed. Special education providers could not provide services to young children in their homes due to COVID-19. In addition, some of these very young children have medical and physical challenges that leave them highly susceptible to significant health risks due to COVID-19.

The calculation does not reflect the number of students for whom an evaluation was requested but is not completed. Those students will be reported in the next data collection. Many of these students have not been evaluated to date because of parental unwillingness to present the student for evaluation during COVID.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
59	59		0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia required that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by July 31st each year (extended to September 30th). LEA reported data revealed some young children were referred to special education from Part C and found eligible but did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday. These LEAs are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 2, as well as Prong 1 monitoring, to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Special Education Directors for the LEAs identified as having noncompliance were required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. The LEAs must submit additional data to verify that systemic corrections and processes are in place. Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations, eligibilities, and IEPs for children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed between July 1 and October 31 were required to be submitted through the Special Education Applications Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 made any necessary changes and are now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

Special Education Directors for the districts identified as having noncompliance, are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late (IEP held beyond the 3rd birthday) and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation and initial IEP were completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each student who exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed and, if eligible, IEP implemented (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	94.25%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.16%	98.40%	99.09%	94.25%	91.36%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
297	326	91.36%	100%	91.10%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

The expectation is that all students 14 and older have an appropriate and compliant transition plan; however, for FFY 19 GADOE reviewed only the transition plans of students age 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review. The GADOE reviewed the transition plans of systems in the FFY19 Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) Cycle. The review consisted of an evaluation of a sampling of each participating CFM system’s transition plans. Based upon the size of the reviewed system, each system had to provide 5 transition plans for review during the CFM process. Plans were reviewed for compliance with the following transition plan indicators: postsecondary outcome goal for employment, postsecondary outcome goal for education/training, postsecondary outcome goal for independent living (if appropriate), reflects steps to desired post-secondary outcomes, postsecondary goals based upon transition assessments, transition services and/or activities to facilitate movement to postsecondary outcomes, course of study to facilitate movement to post-school outcomes, student invited to the meeting, agency representative invited (if applicable) and parental consent received prior to inviting agency representative (if applicable).

For school systems that have transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities will be required.

Prong 1 requires the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 requires the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans. School systems with continued non-compliance are required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determines that the transition plans have the required components for secondary transition.

The GaDOE calculates the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above containing each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans submitted, including those submitted in Prong 2. The GaDOE verifies that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and the Special Education Applications Portal.

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

If no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, validity, and reliability of this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
45	45		0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia did not use the CFM process for the FFY 2018 school year. A sampling process of transition plans for each system was used to determine whether the school system has compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. Five student names meeting the criteria that follows were randomly selected by the GaDOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October. The selected students were at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. School systems had the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GaDOE review. GaDOE staff reviewed all plans submitted and determined compliance. For school systems that had transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required. Prong 2 addressed the implementation of regulatory requirements. Prong 2 required the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required regulatory components for secondary transition. School systems had to demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. All school systems had multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. A webinar series was developed for all school systems to promote compliance for Transition Planning. In addition, GaDOE developed a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA). GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 made any necessary changes and are now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements

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

Prong 1 required the correction of individual noncompliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2018 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data (i.e., a revised transition plan) subsequently collected through the State secured data system (Special Education Applications). The state verified that for each student determined to have noncompliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance. Numerous technical assistance and professional development opportunities were provided to the noncompliant systems on revising individual noncompliant plans such as a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	24.80%	25.50%	26.25%	27.00%	27.40%
A	27.23%	Data	24.39%	26.00%	25.80%	25.95%	24.44%
B	2009	Target >=	53.60%	53.70%	53.70%	53.90%	54.00%
B	51.46%	Data	53.73%	56.07%	58.75%	59.76%	58.40%
C	2009	Target >=	79.90%	80.00%	80.00%	80.10%	80.10%
C	77.08%	Data	81.04%	78.46%	82.88%	82.92%	84.77%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	27.40%
Target B >=	54.00%
Target C >=	80.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2019 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	11,056
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,832
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3,556
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	1,200
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1,697

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,832	11,056	24.44%	27.40%	25.62%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6,388	11,056	58.40%	54.00%	57.78%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	9,285	11,056	84.77%	80.10%	83.98%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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

An analysis of the response data related to youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school indicated that Georgia's response data is representative of the race/ethnicity of the students who exited and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. All race/ethnicity groups had a less than 1% difference between the percent enrollment for race/ethnicity and the percent for the rate of response for the category. Georgia's response data is also representative of the disability area of the students who exited and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. The difference between the percent of exiters by disability area and the percent for the rate of response for the disability area was equal to or less than 0.1% for all areas of disability.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, validity and reliability of this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19. However, the number of students participating in higher education may have been slightly depressed due to COVID-19 and college/university interruptions and closures. Georgia has placed an emphasis upon intentional instruction in self-determination which would allow students to be able to focus on their strengths (strength-based assessments, learning and planning) to direct them towards their desired postsecondary outcome. The state is initiating training and programs to address these deficit areas. We are also working closely with other divisions within GaDOE to provide technical assistance to general education teachers, as well as, special education personnel to ensure that each student has the skills necessary to achieve their desired postsecondary outcome. GaDOE has been focusing upon comprehensive development and implementation of transition processes with intentionality to improve student outcomes. GaDOE is also focusing upon the use of technology and interagency collaboration to support students in reaching productive and desirable outcomes.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	37
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	16

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local

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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	88.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	62.70%	62.80%	62.90%	63.00%	63.10%
Data	62.90%	64.55%	57.83%	45.83%	60.98%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	63.10%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
16	37	60.98%	63.10%	43.24%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

An Executive Order from Governor Brian Kemp closed all in-person instruction due to COVID-19 for the 2019-2020 school year with all contact occurring virtually. Parents and LEAs were extremely limited in their ability to pursue Resolution Sessions even with virtual options provided. Parents and LEAs who were already experiencing stress regarding special education provision were less likely to successfully pursue virtual options. In addition, no third party, such as a mediator, could be involved to promote communication and agreement in these trying circumstances. The circumstances of COVID-19 coupled with the variability of resolution success led to slippage on this indicator

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, validity, and reliability of this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19. GaDOE was limited in mitigating the impact of this Indicator as the process involves only the LEA and the parents. GaDOE cannot be involved as a third party.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	85
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	6
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	50

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. The State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education provided input for the new targets and activities outlined in the SPP and APR. The SAP is comprised of the following membership:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In October 2020, November 2020, and January 2021, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by

the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Director for Special Education with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00% - 70.00%
Data	60.71%	48.53%	54.44%	63.11%	61.54%

Targets

FFY	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	50.00%	70.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	50	85	61.54%	50.00%	70.00%	65.88%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The completeness, validity, and reliability of this indicator were not impacted by COVID-19.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Zelphine Smith-Dixon

Title:

State Director

Email:

zsmith@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone:

4049871568

Submitted on:

04/29/21 7:54:29 AM