

## Florida Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table

### Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]
3. Statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]
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; [Results Indicator] 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. [Compliance Indicator]
5. 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; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]
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]
7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]
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. [Results Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]

10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
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. 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. [Compliance Indicator]
14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

**Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions**  
**(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)**

**Timely Resolution of State Complaints:** 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.

**Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests:** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 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.

**Florida Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Results Data Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2010 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 TARGET</b>
1. Graduation	40.1%	44.4%	51%
2. Drop Out	4.0%	3.7%	≤ 3.25% <sup>1</sup>
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for Disability Subgroup - Reading		1%	New Baseline
A. Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for Disability Subgroup - Math		6%	New Baseline
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	97.9%	95.6%	≥ 99% <sup>2</sup>
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	98%	96.4%	≥ 99%
C. Proficiency Rate - Reading	34.6%	29.2%	≥ 40%
C. Proficiency Rate – Math	40.7%	31.3%	≥ 45%
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	14.9%	8.3%	0%
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	69.2%	69.3%	≥ 70%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	14.9%	14.9%	≤ 14%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	3.6%	3.8%	≤ 3%
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending:			
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program;		30%	Baseline
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		49%	Baseline
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement			
A. Preschool	56.1%	53.9%	≥ 52 %
B. K-12	40.4%	43.2%	≥ 42%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	27.5%	27.5%	≥ 28%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	38.6%	38.9%	≥ 38%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	51%	51.9%	≥ 51%
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	51.2%	52.9%	≥ 59.5%

<sup>1</sup> As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

<sup>2</sup> As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2010 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 TARGET</b>
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	63.9%	64.2%	≥ 75-85%

**7. Percent of Preschool Children Age 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes**

<b>Summary Statement 1<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2010 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2011 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	67.2%	63.3%	≥ 66.1%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	65.9%	63.5%	≥ 59.2%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	58.3%	54.2%	≥ 59.7%
<b>Summary Statement 2<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2010 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2011 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	82.9%	82%	≥ 76%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	67.9%	68.2%	≥ 53.1%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	80.4%	79.4%	≥ 73.5%

<sup>3</sup> **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited 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.

<sup>4</sup> **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.

**Florida Part B FFY 2011 Results Data Summary Notes**

<p>INDICATOR 1: The State revised the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State changed its methodology for calculating the data for FFY 2011 and recalculated the data for FFY 2010 using the same methodology.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3A: The State is reporting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as a result of ESEA flexibility. The State has reported FFY 2011 baseline data based for this indicator based on AMOs.</p> <p>Because the State changed its methodology for this indicator, it is not appropriate to compare the FFY 2011 data and the FFY 2010 data.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3B: OSEP notes that the number of students with IEPs used as the denominator for B3B for reading is 217,388 while the number of students with IEPs used as the denominator for B3B for math is 191,557. The State accounted for the discrepancy. The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3C: The State revised the targets for FFY 2012 for Indicator 3C (the proficiency rate for reading and math) and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the number of students with IEPs used as the denominator for B3C for reading is 207,910 while the number of students with IEPs used as the denominator for B3C for math is 185,830. The State accounted for the discrepancy.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 4A: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy 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 24 of 72 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>

INDICATOR 6: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data, targets for FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 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 2012.

INDICATOR 7:

**REQUIRED ACTION**

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.

INDICATOR 8: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data and a revised target for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised target is less rigorous than the previously-established targets.

**Florida Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Compliance Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2010 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 TARGET</b>	<b>CORRECTION OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010</b>
4B. Significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	98.9%	98.97%	100%	The State reported that all 28 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
12. Early Childhood Transition	99.8%	99.8%	100%	The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
13. Secondary Transition	89.3%	90.9%	100%	The State reported that all 23 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2010 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 TARGET</b>	<b>CORRECTION OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010</b>
15. Timely Correction	98.9%	Not Valid and Reliable	100%	The State reported that all 370 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.
20. Timely and Accurate Data	97.3%	98.84%	100%	

**Florida Part B FFY 2011 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports**

<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>FFY 2010 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>
Timely resolution of complaints	100%	100%
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	100%	100% (based on six due process hearings)

**Florida Part B FFY 2011 Compliance Data Summary Notes**

INDICATOR 4B: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that 24 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. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.

The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.

The State reported that 30 of 72 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in any race/ethnicity category.

INDICATOR 9: The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that one of 73 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 10: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State reported that six districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that three of 73 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities by racial/ethnic group and disability and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 11:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 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.<sup>5</sup> In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 12:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

---

<sup>5</sup> OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

INDICATOR 13:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15:

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported in Indicator 12 that 12 findings of noncompliance were identified and corrected, however, in this indicator the State reported that seven findings of noncompliance were identified and corrected. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 2012 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 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.