

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|---|
| <p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 47%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 43%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 43.5%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.24%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 4.24%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 3.75%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1% for reading and 4% for math. These data remain unchanged for reading from the FFY 2008 data of 1% and represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 3% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 58% for reading and 58% for math.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|--|
| <p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98% for reading and 97.9% for math. These data represent progress for both reading and for math from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 98% for reading and did not meet the FFY 2009 target for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment data.</p> | <p>APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 35.6% for reading and 40.7% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 35.6% for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 39.9% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 48% for reading and 50% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 9.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 3%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 21 of 72 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten disabled or nondisabled students reported as having suspension or expulsions of greater than ten days, and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p><u>LEAs Identified with Significant Discrepancies based on FFY 2008 Data</u></p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s 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 compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the seven LEAs identified with significant</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), and as a result of other monitoring activities conducted by the State. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), six out of seven LEAs' 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 compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data and that the State identified noncompliance in those six LEAs.</p> <p>In addition, the State reported that, apart from the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), four of the seven LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on 2008 data conducted a self-assessment related to the 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 compliance with the IDEA and that all four districts identified noncompliance as a result of this review in 2009 - 2010. The State will verify correction of these findings of noncompliance in 2010 - 2011. In addition, the State reported that, apart from the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), it conducted an onsite focused monitoring visit for one of the seven LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on 2008 data, identified noncompliance, and will verify correction of this finding of noncompliance in 2010-2011.</p> <p><u>LEAs Identified with Significant Discrepancies Based on FFY 2007 Data</u></p> <p>OSEP's June 3, 2010 response table required the State to report the results of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for two of the six LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007 based on 2007-2008 data, reporting whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected LEAs to revise, policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs. The State reported that, in its FFY 2008 APR, it inadvertently reported on the results of the review of the wrong year's districts.</p> <p>In its FFY 2009 APR, the State reported on the six LEAs that were identified in FFY 2007 with significant discrepancies based on 2007-2008 data. The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs' 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2007 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>Although the State did not identify noncompliance through this review, the State</p> | <p>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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the number of findings of noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007 based on FFY 2007 data and the number of findings that were corrected. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s 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 compliance with the IDEA, for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2007 data.</p> <p>In addition, the State reported that, apart from the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), it required the six LEAs to a complete a self-assessment. On page 19 of the FFY 2009 APR the State reported that five of the six districts identified noncompliance and that the noncompliance was corrected. However, on page 20 of the FFY 2009 APR, the State reported that all six districts identified noncompliance and that the noncompliance was corrected. Because of this inconsistent information, OSEP was unable to determine the number of findings of noncompliance that were identified and corrected.</p> | |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that districts with fewer than ten disabled or nondisabled students reported as having suspension or expulsions of greater than ten days are excluded from risk ratio comparisons. The State provided a table displaying “the number of districts where a risk ratio was not calculated due to not meeting the minimum “n” size requirement.” However, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts were totally excluded from the calculation.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p> <p>The State did not provide the number of districts that did not meet the State-established “n” size requirement and were removed from the calculation. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2009 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|------|-------|------|-------|--|------|-------|------|-------|--|------|-----|-----|--------|--|
| <p>more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 363 1583 837"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">63.5</td> <td align="center">66.17</td> <td align="center">60.8</td> <td align="center">2.67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">16.9</td> <td align="center">15.52</td> <td align="center">19.3</td> <td align="center">1.38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.52</td> <td align="center">4.9</td> <td align="center">2.6</td> <td align="center">-1.38%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are 67.17% for 5A, 15.52% for 5B and 4.9% for 5C. These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its targets for 5C.</p> | | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 63.5 | 66.17 | 60.8 | 2.67% | B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 16.9 | 15.52 | 19.3 | 1.38% | C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 3.52 | 4.9 | 2.6 | -1.38% | <p>in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 63.5 | 66.17 | 60.8 | 2.67% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 16.9 | 15.52 | 19.3 | 1.38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 3.52 | 4.9 | 2.6 | -1.38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>6. 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. [Results Indicator; New]</p> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|----|---|------|------|------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|---|
| <p>demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 396 1583 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">65.9</td> <td align="center">70.6</td> <td align="center">65.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">58.8</td> <td align="center">65.6</td> <td align="center">59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">59.5</td> <td align="center">60.7</td> <td align="center">59.5</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">75.8</td> <td align="center">84.1</td> <td align="center">75.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">52.9</td> <td align="center">64.4</td> <td align="center">52.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">73.3</td> <td align="center">80.8</td> <td align="center">73.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p> | <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 65.9 | 70.6 | 65.9 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 58.8 | 65.6 | 59 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 59.5 | 60.7 | 59.5 | <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 75.8 | 84.1 | 75.8 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 52.9 | 64.4 | 52.9 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 73.3 | 80.8 | 73.3 | <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 65.9 | 70.6 | 65.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 58.8 | 65.6 | 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 59.5 | 60.7 | 59.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 75.8 | 84.1 | 75.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 52.9 | 64.4 | 52.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 73.3 | 80.8 | 73.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| <p>8. 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 preschool reported data for this indicator are 53%. The State's FFY 2009 K-12 reported data for this indicator are 39.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 43% for preschool and 32% for K-12. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 50% for preschool and did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 40% for K-12.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported on the number of districts, by race, that did not meet the minimum "n" size, ranging from one district for white students to 58 districts for American Indian/Alaskan Native students. However, the State did not report the total unduplicated number of districts excluded from the calculation.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2010 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement and were excluded from the calculation.</p> |
| <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.17%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 1.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported a minimum “n” size requirement of “30 by disability and racial and ethnic group and provided a table displaying the number of districts that did not meet the minimum “n” size requirement by race and disability. However, OSEP is unable to determine whether any districts were totally excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the three districts identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data 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 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In its FFY 2010 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement and were excluded from the calculation.</p> |
| <p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1,742 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |
| <p>12. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 59 its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |
| <p>13. 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.</p> | <p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 82.3%.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | | <p>indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |
| <p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high</p> | <p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> | <p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| <p>school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>A. 27% enrolled in high school within one year of leaving school. B. 37% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. 50% 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.</p> | |
| <p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 72.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%. The State reported that it verified correction of findings of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 after the conclusion of the one-year timeline. The State did not report as timely corrected the findings that the State verified as corrected after the conclusion of the one-year timeline.</p> <p>The State reported that 390 of 539 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the 149 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> | <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A,10, 11,12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators</p> |
| <p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on eight due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p> |
| <p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 63.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 58.5%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 73%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 75-85%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.2%. The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR</p> |

Florida Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>§§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |