



Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Part B State Annual Performance Report
APR CLARIFICATION SUBMISSION, 5/17/2013
FFY 2011
February 15, 2013

Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2010

Table of Contents

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 5

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school..... 9

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments 14

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:..... 2019

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: 2224

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: 2524

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
..... 2827

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 3433

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. 3938

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. 4039

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..... 4140

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. 474544

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals..... 535049

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:..... 615856

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..... 666364

Indicator 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. 747169

Indicator 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. 797674

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements..... 848179

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. 878482

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. 908785

INTRODUCTION

In the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) the Secretariat of Special Education (“SAEE” by its Spanish acronym) oversees the management and implementation of the requirements with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) PL 108-446, Part B Program. PRDE is a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. Also, PRDE is composed of seven educational regions, with 4 school districts in each educational region (a total of 28 Schools Districts).

Also, PRDE SAEE oversees a total of nine *Centros de Servicio de Educación Especial*, Special Education Service Centers, (‘CSEEs’ by the Spanish acronym). The CSEEs are located in Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Humacao, Mayagüez, Morovis, Ponce, San Germán, and San Juan. They operate at the Regional level and were established to provide and assist students with disabilities and their parents with special education services. The CSEEs offer services for children transitioning from Part C to B including their parents and are also the liaison and support for the school facilitators who offer the services at the school level. The services provided in the CSEEs start with registration, evaluation, determination processes and coordination of therapy. The CSEEs have the Assistive Technology Advisory Committees (‘CAAT’ by its acronym in Spanish) this committee includes the professional experts who have the responsibility of providing the Assistive Technology evaluation.

Since FFY 2010 APR, SAEE personnel from the Analysis of Data and Compliance Unit, in collaboration with the Data Unit, established the strategy of holding a meeting during spring of each year with the CSEE Directors, discuss APR results and to timely collect, validate and update all data which will be used to report on the APR. This strategy has been proven to be successful because the CSEE Directors serve as subject matter experts and are an essential part of our General Supervision System. These meeting usually take place during the spring of each year. After these meeting the CSEE Directors held meetings at each Region with the Districts Facilitators and School Level Facilitators to provide information provided in the previous meeting. To support this strategy individual meetings are held with the SAEE Central Level personnel who are in charge of Indicators and are the ones responsible to provide direct technical assistance as needed.

PRDE SAEE’s continues with the improvement activities during FFY 2010 which proved to be efficient including the creation and implementation, maintenance of taskforces to assist with data validation and overall support at the CSEEs, and the information system for tracking requests for assistive technology equipment from requisition through to delivery.

The Data Analysis and Compliance Unit and the Data Unit received support in these efforts from outside contractors and technical assistance providers, the Southeast Regional Resource Center (‘SERRC’) and the Data Accountability Center (‘DAC’). Much of the technical assistances received from SERRC and DAC during FFY 2011 focused on areas of general supervision, including on-site monitoring, correction of non-compliance, Part C to B transition and the New Results Strategy established by OSEP last year. DAC has provided concentrated efforts working with the Data Unit to assist the unit in establishing written data verification procedures. Puerto Rico’s FFY 2011 APR continues to demonstrate the outcomes of hard work and commitment sustained over many years to address several areas of compliance under IDEA. PRDE can report that this years APR performance is continues to reflect the extensive efforts, resulting in performance and compliance.

For FFY 2011, PRDE has achieved substantial compliance with all compliance indicators, with actual measurement data for these indicators at/or above 75%. Highlights include PRDE’s maintaining 100% compliance for Indicator 16 (timely issuance of State Complaint decisions); 100% compliance for

indicator 15 (general supervision system) and surpassing the 90% compliance mark for Indicators 12 (children referred by Part C to Part B); 13 (secondary transition goals) and 20 (timely submission of valid and reliable data).

During the first week of October 2011, the United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) conducted a Continuous Improvement Results verification visit to the PRDE. The last two days of the visit focused on PRDE's results topic, post-secondary outcomes. The results visit included meetings with more than 20 special education stakeholders representing parents and families of students with disabilities, the public vocational rehabilitation agency, universities, business, community development enterprises, and education service agencies. This distinguished group met for 1.5 days to conceptualize a draft strategic plan designed to develop partnerships and collaborations that improve post-secondary options (using OSEP's definition of higher education, competitive employment, postsecondary training and other employment) for youth with disabilities. In order to simplify accountability for results improvement, the scope of the plan was further designed to improve results specifically for Indicator B14.a and B14.b (enrollment in higher education or competitive employment, respectively). The improvement plan is referenced in Indicator 14, and included with this APR submission at Attachment A.

In July 2011, SAEE held a meeting with stakeholders to review SAEE progress over the past year and gather stakeholder feedback on improvement activities in progress and schedule for the coming academic school year. Afterward meetings were held with the Directors of the PRDE Counselors and Social workers Divisions to create new strategies of collaboration with these areas in order to use PRDEs personell and establish a relationship of cooperation between programs.SAEE technical assistance personell and Compliance Unit Data personnel provided several orientations with the facilitators from these programs in order for them to better understand the reporting required by OSEP and the importance of their collaboration in the new effort of the Result Indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

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

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2010 2010-2011 ¹	66.5%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 APR (FFY 2010 period): 46.7%:

According to the Part B Indicator Measurement Table, Indicator's 1 data needs to be evaluated the year prior to the reporting period. The data used to calculate the actual measurement for the FFY 2011 APR is based on the graduation rate from the 2010-2011 school year.

As reported in the previous APRs, PRDE requested a deadline extension for reporting the four-year graduation rate data required under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(4)(ii)(a). In response to the PRDE's deadline extension request, a letter was received on July 21, 2009, approving the following: (1) use of a three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, (2) a one-year extension to report its three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and (3) to continue using the graduation rate in its current Accountability Workbook as a transitional rate until a three-year adjusted graduation rate in 2011-12 can be reported. Up to 2011-12, PRDE will continue to use the transitional graduation rate as described in the approved PRDE Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. This rate is an adaptation of the method recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics. The Data was collected from the total of schools, not by student, and included in the state level. An additional aggregation at the school level was the collection for all students, without any subgroup designations. Therefore, the data PRDE reported in the CSPR was an aggregated graduation rate; no disaggregation by subgroup was reported

PRDE used the 618 Exiting data once again for reporting on this indicator, because the CSPR data is not collected by subgroup designations. PRDE used the Section 618 Data Report, Table 4 *Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education* as the data source for this indicator. Specifically, PRDE used data from the "All Disabilities" page (Tab 13 of Table 4). Data from Row B (graduated with regular high school diploma) is divided by all school exits represented in the sum of Tab 13 Rows B, C ("received a certificate"), D ("reached a maximum age"), E ("died"), and G

¹ The period at issue under Indicator 1 for the FFY 2011 APR submission is FFY 2010; accordingly, as advised by OSEP, the appropriate Indicator 1 target for the FFY 2011 APR is that listed for FFY 2010 in Puerto Rico's SPP.

("dropped out"). PRDE used this data to establish the baseline and targets. The 2010-2011 data is reported below, along with the actual calculation measurement..

Data for 2010-2011:

B. Graduated with regular high school diploma	C. Received a certificate	D. Reached Maximum Age	E. Died	G. Dropped out	(B + C + D + E + G)
2,356	320	160	19	2,186	5,041

Actual Measurement for FFY 2010 Reporting:

B. Graduated with regular high school diploma	Divided by (B + C + D + E + G)	FFY 2010 Actual Target Data
2,356	.4674	46.7%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Data reviews demonstrate that a total of 2,356 students with disabilities graduated from high school with a regular diploma out of the 5,041 students with disabilities who exited during the 2010-2011 school year, resulting in 46.7% as the actual measurement for Indicator 1. This reflects slippage from the FFY 2010 APR. Nonetheless, compared to the FFY 2010 APR, the data reflects that the total number of students that graduated with a regular high school diploma as well as the number of students who exited with a certificate increased.

With the recruitment of the 1,294 School Facilitators to coordinate and support special education program requirements at the school level, have contributed to ensuring more accurate and valid data. The School Facilitators located at the school level assist in carrying out the verification procedures for data entered at the school level. As a result of such efforts, the database is steadily reflecting a more accurate count of students exiting special education.

PRDE requires 19 credits to graduate with a regular high school diploma. This requirement is the same for students with disabilities.

The following chart provides a summary discussion of the improvement activities undertaken during 2011-2012.

Activities	Discussion on improvement activities completed
1. Maintaining special education support, placement options, streamlined procedures, transition planning available to IEP students in high school as a means of working to maintain a high graduation rate.	PRDE is continuing these efforts. More emphasis has been placed in the identification of appropriate placement where the students benefit from peer interaction, courses of study and other areas regarding their preferences and interest after each student's transition assessment. PRDE SAEЕ participated in a committee of the Governor focused on strengthening interagency coordination to promote services for the special education community including children with disabilities.
2. Maintaining special education support, professional development,	PRDE is continuing these efforts. During FFY 2011, the Technical Assistance (TA) Unit held a series of trainings and technical

Activities	Discussion on improvement activities completed
<p>technical assistance available to high school teachers and other personnel.</p>	<p>assistance visits for Special Education District Facilitator regarding the cluster of Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14. The TA Unit developed these training and technical assistance sessions to address areas of concern identified by the Monitoring and Compliance Unit as a result of their review of the district self-assessment and on-site monitoring visits.</p> <p>This is a continuous activity.</p>
<p>3. Continue to monitor graduation rates and foster retention in schools.</p>	<p>PRDE has continued tracking its graduation rates and fostering retention in schools. PRDE has placed Transition Coordinators at the regional level, which has led to more effective collaboration between Professional School Counselors and School Directors regarding the inclusion and participation of special education students in school activities. Also, the provision of alternatives such as team teaching in regular classrooms, giving credits for resource room attendance, assuring accommodation provisions, and regular teachers and counselor interviews with the students will help student's retention to obtain a high school diploma as a goal.</p> <p>PRDE is working on the graduation rate and set a first cohort of students for 2009-2010 who were scheduled to graduate in 2012. This places PRDE on time to be able to provide its graduation rate under the new calculation for 2011-2012.</p> <p>Special education students were included in the cohorts as part of the process. Having identified these students in advance aids teachers and coordinators in tracking and monitoring their status year by year leading to the opportunity to provide additional activities and necessary support to reach the final goal.</p>
<p>4. Evaluate Table 4 data collection methods and participate in activities to help ensure reliable data collection; continue data validation activities.</p>	<p>Technical Assistance received by DAC remains ongoing to assure successful completion of this task. Trials of reporting for secondary transition and exiting have been done with satisfactory results in obtaining direct data from the system.</p> <p>In FFY 2010, PRDE SAEI continued its efforts in data exchange amongst all existing applications to ensure consistency and complete data for all special education students.</p>
<p>5. Explore and develop activities regarding alternatives for students' school retention and to promote improved graduation rates.</p>	<p>Meetings with Transition Coordinators generate common activities to share with the teachers and provide ideas to school communities for student retention and improving graduation rates. The inclusion of students with disabilities in career fairs, on-site visits, school programs (such as Juvenile Organizations, School Clubs, and similar programs where they join their peers), as well as initiatives like students with disabilities receiving academic credit for special education resource room attendance and promoting students with disabilities direct participation in their IEP revision, among other items, have contributed to better outcomes for school retention. This activity is complete but monthly transition meetings will continue in order to further discuss these areas.</p>

Activities	Discussion on improvement activities completed
6. Training in graduation rate PRDE new policy.	PRDE held a training regarding the revised graduation policy.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2010 2010-2011²</i>	21.75%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 APR (FFY 2010 period): 43.36%

In accordance with the Part B Indicator Measurement Table, data for indicator 2 should be revised during the prior year prior to the reporting period. Accordingly, the data used to calculate the actual measurement for the FFY 2011 APR is based on graduation rate data from the 2010-2011 school years.

This indicator requires the SEA to report the percent of special education youth high school dropouts with IEPs reported. In the FFY 2006 APR, Puerto Rico established its baseline and its annual measurable and rigorous targets based on this indicator 2 approach. PRDE defines “high school dropouts with IEP” as students who leave school prior to completing the academic program, which is consistent with the definition used in the Section 618 data report. Specifically, “dropped out” means a student or school-age youth that leaves school without achieving an orderly administrative procedure to disengage from the education system. This definition is the same for students with disabilities.

As noted in Indicator 1, PRDE is collecting aggregated data using the graduation rate established in the Puerto Rico’s Accountability Workbook. PRDE uses its Section 618 Data Report, Table 4 Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education as the data source for this indicator. Specifically, PRDE uses data from the “All Disabilities” page (Tab 13 of Table 4). Data from Row G (“dropped out”) is divided by the total sum of the data from Rows B (“graduated with regular high school diploma”), C (“received a certificate”), D (“reached a maximum age”), E (“died”), and G (“dropped out”).

² The period at issue under Indicator 2 for the FFY 2011 APR submission is FFY 2010, accordingly, as advised by OSEP, the appropriate Indicator 2 target for the FFY 2011 APR is that listed for FFY 2010 in Puerto Rico’s SPP.

In accordance with the Part B Indicator Measurement Table, data for indicator 2 should be revised during the prior year prior to the reporting period. Accordingly, the data used to calculate the actual measurement for the FFY 2011 APR is based on graduation rate data from the 2010-2011 school year.

The 2010-2011 data is reported below, along with the actual calculation measurement calculation.

Data for 2010-2011:

B. Graduated with regular high school diploma	C. Received a certificate	D. Reached Maximum Age	E. Died	G. Dropped out	(B + C + D + E + G)
2,356	320	160	19	2,186	5,041

Actual Measurement for FFY 2011 Reporting:

G. Dropped Out	Divided by (B + C + D + E + G)	FFY 2010 Actual Data
2,186	0.4336	43.36%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Data reviews demonstrate that a total of 2,186 students dropped out from high school. Applying the calculation, PRDE’s drop-out rate for 2010-2011 is 43.36%, which represents an increase from the 2009-2010 actual data, which reflected a drop-out rate of 41.59%.

Students’ reasons exiting the regular diploma program vary from the need to work in search of an economic independence, or a lack of resources, school apathy, or a desire for less rigorous academic challenges. Students who qualified as “dropping out” under this definition include students who are leaving the system or their placements in order to engage in other academic alternatives in order to complete high school graduation requirements—just not with a regular diploma or certificate.

Many PRDE special education students included as “dropped out” currently enrolled in the adult education program and CASA program, which are PRDE alternatives allow students to obtain a diploma that will be enough in order to get them enrolled in universities and/or find jobs. For 2010-2011, the adult education program enrolled approximately **222** students with IEPs who dropped out of school. . Also, 193 students were referred to the Management Training for Employers and Future Employees (referred to as AAFET, by its Spanish acronym), a private vocational program contracted by SAE. AAFET provides training to young people from 16 years old and above, who have left the formal education system and are unemployed. These trainings prepare them to develop skills in different vocational areas so they can achieve and maintain employment and / or establish their own business. Courses are offered in various categories like manufacturing, engineering, construction and services, which have an emphasis on the labor market demands. If this category of students did not count as drop outs, this might significantly improve PRDE’s Actual Measurement for this Indicator.

Other students are opting to leave special education, looking for fast track programs that will help them obtain, in one or two years, a high school diploma with the same PRDE regulations, but with curricular modifications emphasizing their needs and targeting the development of necessary skills approved by the College Board for University or College admission.

PRDE has continued with the development of several alternatives to work as prevention measures. These include:

- Referrals to private sector organizations - when a student is identified as at risk to drop out of school, in order to assist with preventing the student from dropping out, PRDE refers the student to the private sector for counseling services and other positive intervention initiatives that could help with retention. Many of these private sector organizations also have programs to work with students in the event they do drop out to ensure students continue their education through another avenue or find work, etc. (e.g., Sor Isolina Centers, Aspira).
- Proyecto Casa (ASPIRA) - provides an educational center for students to complete their academic and vocational studies in a minimum amount of time with the purpose of incorporating these students into the community, integrating them in the working world, and allowing the students to continue post-secondary studies. This project exists in all PRDE's seven Regions.
- Learn and Serve of America - is an alternative to provide students at risk an opportunity to help others such as children in hospitals, homeless individuals, and the elderly during their free time after school hours and/or over the weekend.
- Grade placement tests - are given to students that have failed for three years in the same grade and students whose ages do not correspond to their grade. If a student passes this test, the student will be placed in the appropriate grade—which can help with self-esteem and motivation.
- The PRDE Training and School Counseling Program sponsors various projects to strengthen student retention, including³:
 - Proyecto Conoce, Explora, Participa y Actúa (CPA) - this project, which is held in collaboration with the College Board serves seventh grade special education students. Students are evaluated for drop-out risk indicators. Workshops and other interventions are held in order to help address drop-out risk concerns.
 - Programa Centro Evaluación Ocupacional (CREO) - intermediate and high school students are evaluated for indicators related to study habits. As well as emotional and occupational issues. This initiative implements strategies for students that are placed in contained classrooms.
 - Aprendiendo a Estudiar con Amor - this strategy aims to improve parental and teacher involvement in assisting kindergarten students through third grade in order to develop positive attitudes towards studying and school. This is a motivational educational strategy that employs music and written exercises.
 - Career Education Responsive to Every Student (CERER) - this integrated curriculum program educates kindergarten students through sixth grade on future career opportunities in the working world. The program encourages students to explore career options in order to get them thinking about transition from school into business and other opportunities.
 - Modelo Curricular de Prevención Integrado al Currículo Académico de Nivel Elemental e Intermedio - this model helps in preventing drop-outs and is implemented from kindergarten through twelve grade. This model was developed in order to modify student's knowledge, attitudes, and conduct.

³ <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/tags/orientacion-y-consejeria>

- Escuela Para Padres – this is a capacity building opportunity for parents to learn strategies on a variety of themes including study habits, bullying, sexuality, drop-out, and childrearing.

In addition to the efforts and programs discussed above, PRDE held many additional activities related to drop-out prevention including:

- Programa de Educación Comunal de Entrega y Servicios (PECES) – this activity consisted of a series of workshops in the Humacao region for students ages 9-18 which addressed pregnancy and drop-out prevention. These workshops were offered during the spring and summer of 2011.

The following chart provides a summary discussion of the improvement activities under taken during 2011-2012.

Activities	Discussion of improvement activities completed
1. Increase special education support available for high school students.	PRDE School Counseling Program and the Social Workers Program have undertaken efforts regarding preventative activities in order to support high school students including special education students. See activities discussed above.
2. Increase special education support for teachers and other high school personnel.	This is an on-going activity. PRDE SAEЕ is continuing these efforts. During FFY 2011, the Technical Assistance (TA) Unit held trainings and technical assistance visits for special education teachers and school directors regarding Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 clusters. The TA Unit developed these training and technical assistance sessions in order to address areas of concern identified by the Monitoring and Compliance Unit as a result of the district self-assessment and on-site monitoring visits review.
3. Target in and provide support to districts that are reporting higher numbers of students dropping out of high school.	PRDE SAEЕ is continuing these efforts. PRDE has undertaken efforts regarding preventative activities in order to provide support to school districts with high risk students population, including the School Counseling Program as discussed above.
4. Continue to collect and validate drop out data for IEP students.	PRDE collects this data based on child count for exiting table. This table includes all the possible reasons for exiting. The SIS collects information regarding the student status at the end of the year. After completing the matching of SEASWeb and SIS data, PRDE will validate and share dropout data using it in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and by following the Department's timeline stated under ESEA agreements and approved by PRDE.

Activities	Discussion of improvement activities completed
	<p>DAC continues assisting SAEE and the SEASWeb data manager in order to make sure it is well suited to assist with the documents and tables required for OSEP's for reporting.</p> <p>PRDE is continuing these efforts. See activities discussed above.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 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. Puerto Rico is a unitary system, thus part A is not applicable to PRDE.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in ~~the~~an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated 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.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = ((# of children with IEPs **scoring at or above proficient at grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient**) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs **who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and enrolled for a full academic year**, calculated 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.**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	<p><u>INDICATOR 3B:</u> Maintain Baseline (98.73% for Spanish, 98.44% for Math)</p> <p><u>INDICATOR 3C:</u> Increase to (25.5% for Spanish and 21.5% for Math)</p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

	Spanish	Math
3B, Participation	98.79%	98.89%
3C, Proficiency	30.98%	25.31%

Puerto Rico reports publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children. The publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2011 can be viewed on-line at: <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/informes-de-desempeno-de-estudiantes-con-impedimento-en-las-ppea>, <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/tags/educacion-especial>.

The data source used for this indicator is the data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA. Table 6 for the 618 data collection for the participation and performance of students with disabilities on State Assessments submitted as EDEN-only.

Actual Target Data and Measurement for Part B, Participation, for FFY 2011:

Data Year and Examination	a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed	b. # of children with IEPs in RA with no accomm.	c. # of children with IEPs in RA with accomm.	d. # of children with IEPs in AA against GLAS	e. # of children with IEPs in AA against AAS	Measurement [[$(b + c + d + e) / a$] x 100]
2011-2012 Spanish Participation	58,210	7,758	47,481	0	2,266	<u>98.79%</u>
2011-2012 Math Participation	58,210	7,761	47,537	0	2,266	<u>98.89%</u>

Actual Target Data and Measurement for Part C, Proficiency, for FFY 2011:

Data Year and Examination	a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed	b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the RA with no accomm.	c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the RA with accomm.	d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the AA against GLS	e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the AA against AAS	Measurement [[$(b + c + d + e) / a$] x 100]
2011-2012, Spanish Proficiency	58,210	2,508	14,899	0	628	<u>30.98%</u>
2011-2012, Math Proficiency	58,210	1,969	12,115	0	649	<u>25.31%</u>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

PRDE administered its regular and alternate assessment island wide for the 2011-2012 school years during April 20-27, 2012. The tests are known as the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de

Aprovechamiento Académico (PPAA) and the Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alternativa (PPEA). The PPEA is the AA-AAS administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities.

The state assessment system ensures the participation of students in grades 3-8 and 11 in Spanish, Math, and English as a Second Language as well as in Science for students in grades 4, 8 and 11. Students with IEPs may participate in the PPAA with or without accommodations or in the PPEA based on what is appropriate pursuant to the child's IEP.


PRDE revised its content standards and grade level expectations during the 2007-2008 school year. The learning expectations were rigorous and clearly defined for each grade. The PPAA and PPEA were revised for the 2008-2009 assessment administration and were aligned to the 2007-2008 content standards and grade level expectations. The PPAA is composed of multiple choice and constructed response items. The mathematics tests contain grid-in items. Prior to the 2008-2009 administration, the PPAA test was composed exclusively of multiple choice items.

The PPEA represents a multi-disciplinary approach to assessing student learning and providing access to grade-level learning standards and varied opportunities to learn. A strength of the PPEA is its flexibility in teacher-designed assessment tasks to meet the individual needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. The following statements clarify the PPEA's design method:

- PRDE has employed a development process to create strongly linked standards/PPEA entry targets that are academic and grade referenced. This has resulted in the overall system being organized by grade level and content strands that are consistent with general education PPAA content and content strands.
- The approach of organizing the targeted content of PPEA entry targets with multiple subparts for data collection allows for breaking down larger grade-level expectations into smaller, measurable objectives, even though teachers are guided to "bundle" the subparts for meaningful instruction. The strategy of bundling entry targets for instruction attempts to avoid instruction that is disjointed or does not measure progress in small enough increments to be meaningful for students. Intentional bundling encourages teachers and students to make connections between and among the content of entry targets.


PRDE met its FFY 2011 participation targets and demonstrated increased participation compared to last year. Actual percentages are shown in the following table. As reflected therein, the data for 2011-2012 assessments demonstrates slight increases in participation for both Spanish (0.06%) and Math (0.08%) as compared to the FFY 2010 assessment.

COMPARISON OF FFY 2011 PARTICIPATION ACTUAL DATA TO PRIOR YEARS								
Subject	FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
PARTICIPATION: Spanish	97.76%	98.73%	95.52%	98.59%	98.30%	98.20%	98.73%	98.79%
PARTICIPATION: Math	97.69%	98.44%	96.99%	98.43%	98.01%	98.31%	98.81%	98.89%



PRDE also met its FFY 2011 proficiency targets. PRDE exceeded its Spanish proficiency target (25.5%) by 5.98% and its Math proficiency target (21.5%) by 3.81%. These were improved proficiency results from FFY 2010, of 1.44% in Spanish and 2.08% in Math, as reflected in the table below.

COMPARISON OF FFY 2011 PERFORMANCE TO PRIOR YEARS SINCE REVISING THE BASELINE				
Subject	FFY 2008 (Baseline)	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
PERFORMANCE: Spanish	24.27%	26.81%	29.54%	30.98%
PERFORMANCE: Math	19.30%	22.20%	23.23%	25.31%



PRDE held various meetings to provide training and dissemination activities related to the PPAA and PPEA. PRDE also ensured that the process of administering the PPAA and PPEA was held effectively and in an organized matter.

In addition, PRDE continued its practice of providing informational booklets to familiarize educators, parents and students in Puerto Rico with the PPAA tests. The booklets provided helpful explanations that enabled the students to get a comprehensive grasp of the tests. The PPEA teachers' guide was also revised to provide teachers with a clearer understanding of standards based instruction for the alternate assessment for children with significant cognitive disabilities.

PRDE, continued its work with Pearson, offered technical assistance to special education teachers who had students participating in the PPEA to help them develop and manage the student portfolios. During this training, teachers were provided with two tools: 1.) The Resources Guide,

which contains the activities and the standards to be implemented for the student and 2.) The Teachers' Guide, which includes the actual template forms to be used for administering the assessments.

PRDE scheduled and conducted onsite monitoring visits throughout the schools island wide before, during, and after the test administration period. The process of monitoring for PPEA included supervision of the process, monitoring of security regulations and the use and availability of resources like the teachers' guide, resource guide and portfolio distribution, among others. Also, PRDE reviewed a sample of the files of students who participated in the PPEA to determine whether the procedural safeguards and the Criteria Guide were complied with, including and if there was evidence of the orientation given to parents regarding the participation of their children in the PPEA/PPAA.

PRDE has its on-going activity of providing professional development for teaching to the grade level standards and best practices island wide. Trainings were held at the regional/district levels with teachers and Spanish, Math, ESL and Science content area experts. Professional development and technical assistance opportunities were provided to support general and special education teachers. A resource guide for teaching to grade level expectations for special education teachers was developed and has been posted on the department's website.⁴ Follow-up training on the use of accommodations for students with disabilities were also provided at the regional and district level.

During the month of September the SAEE participated, as every year in the committee responsible for handling AYP appeals. This participation was important as it allowed SAEE to describe the educational needs of our program to assure that reasonable accommodations were applied adequately and for computing the academic index for the students.

PRDE has included in the SIS system the assessment options available for students with IEPs and used it to obtain the data for FFY 2011. PRDE continues to develop its Student Information System (SIS) and data validation process for tracking student participation. Data entry and data review processes take place continuously. Schools have successfully enrolled their students in the SIS and continue to update changes in their enrollments.

The following chart provides a summary discussion of the improvement activities under taken during 2011-2012.

Activities	Discussion
1. Support personnel development for the teaching methodologies, teaching to grade level standards, and teaching best practices	See discussion above. PRDE continues with this effort.
2. Increase technical assistance and support to regular and special education teachers and service providers on teaching strategies and methodologies	See discussion above. PRDE continues to provide technical assistance and support to general and special education teachers and service providers on teaching strategies and methodologies.

⁴ The link to a PDF of the resource guide for teaching to grade level expectations can be found on-line at: <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/ppaa>. Once at that page, scroll down to the sub-section entitled "PRUEBAS PUERTORRIQUEÑAS DE EVALUACIÓN ALTERNA (PPEA)", and the link for the guide ("Guía de recurso para el maestro") appears under the list of document 'Documentos'

<p>3. Continue TA for regular and special education teachers on the use of accommodations for students with disabilities</p>	<p>The technical assistance and professional development for teachers included the use of accommodations for students with disabilities. PRDE will continue with this effort.</p>
--	---

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Measurement:

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of districts 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 (# of districts in the State)] times 100. |
|--|

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	.001%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: .0061%

Indicator 4 (a)

In accordance with the Part B Indicator Measurement Table, data for the year prior to the reporting year is to be examined for Indicator 4. Accordingly, data used to calculate the actual measurement for this indicator for the FFY 2011 APR comes from discipline data for 2010-2011.

For 2010-2011, the *Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal* (618 data, Table 5) shows that 8 students were removed or suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (Section A, Column 3B). This represents **.006%** (8/129,314) of the total students based on the 2010-2011 child count report. PRDE did not meet its target of .001% for this indicator

SAEE collected data for Indicator 4 using a web-based application to collect the suspension rate of students with IEP's. This application was designed specially to account for IDEA requirements.

During summer the MCU in cooperation with the IDEA Data Manager sent a memo with the data collection and validation process work plan. This work plan was designed as the past two years to ensure a timely process for collecting and validating data and included specific due dates for entry into the web-based application. The CSEE Directors were designated as the official liaisons to the District Superintendents and School Facilitators at the school level. After data reports are submitted through the system, the PRDE Planning Unit reviews the data.

The Data Unit from SAEЕ analyzes and validates the reports ensuring all schools submitted the necessary data to complete the discipline report. Then the Data Manager submits the files to the PRDE Ed Facts Coordinator from the Planning Unit. The Island-wide report is then completed and submitted as part of the Section 618 data – Table 5, Section A, Columns 3A, 3B, 3C, Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for more than 10 Days of the Annual Report of Children Served.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress for FFY 2011:

PRDE provides ongoing training to their personnel on disciplinary requirements, including how and when to apply the discipline procedures observing the IDEA requirements. Trainings are provided to Special Education School and District Facilitators. Additionally, the Technical Assistance Unit provides individualized trainings to districts, facilitators, school facilitators and teachers based on their unique needs.

In an effort to ensure discipline data collected for Table 5 is valid and reliable, PRDE SAEЕ issued a Memo to personnel regarding data collection and entry for this indicator. This memo laid out important definitions such as disciplinary measures, behavior, and behavioral actions, in accordance with IDEA. The letter reviewed the instructions for collecting suspension data and included a guide and a glossary with definitions for key terms such as suspension and disciplinary measures.

The following chart provides a summary discussion of the improvement activities under taken during 2010-2011.

Activity	Discussion
1. Personnel training for the use of the manual for positive behavior supports and functional behavior analysis	PRDE provided training on a variety of topics to special education teachers and School Facilitators including School , including disciplinary procedures for special education students, functional behavior analysis, and behavioral intervention plans. These activities will continue in an ongoing basis.
2. Continue to support regular and special education teachers in the use of best practices for discipline procedures.	The Technical Assistance Unit provides trainings throughout the whole school year for general and special education teachers, school directors, and facilitators. District facilitators for special education provide follow-up regarding discipline procedures, including the review of IEPs and the use of procedural safeguards regarding behavioral interventions.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs 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. B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs 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. C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. |
|---|

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	Special education students who spent less than 21% of the day outside regular class = 75.5% Special education students who spent greater than 60% of the day outside regular class= 13.8% Special education students placed in private/public separate schools; residential institutions; placed in hospitals and homebound = 1.28%

Actual Target Data for FY 2011: A) 77.65 %; B) 7.63 %; C) 3.17%

PRDE collects data on students' placements for the 618 data submission from the SEASWEB database. The data reported for this indicator are taken from Table 3, IDEA Implementation of FAPE requirements. The following table reflects the raw data and measurement calculations leading to the FFY 2011 actual target data reflected above.

a. Total Child Count	b. IEP students removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day		c. IEP students removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day		d. IEP students served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	
	#	% (b/a)	#	% (c/a)	#	% (d/a)
114,523	88,924	77.65%	8,740	7.63%	3,629	3.17%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2011:

PRDE met its FFY 2011 targets for 5A and 5B of this indicator. As compared to FFY 2010 data, PRDE showed improvement with parts 5B and 5C, but not part 5A, of this indicator. Although the data for indicator 5A shows a decrease of 3 percentage points, PRDE exceeded the target by 2.15 percentage points. As for indicator 5B, PRDE improved by about half of a percentage point and exceeded the target by more than 6 percentage points. Regarding 5C, PRDE data shows a minor decrease in the percentage of students in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements of 0.03 percentage points as compared to FFY 2010, missing its target for 5C by 1.89 percentage points. To validate the accuracy of the data for this indicator PRDE generated continuous data reports that were sent to the Regional Facilitators, CSEE Directors, and the School Facilitators. These personnel were then responsible for verifying the placement data and making any necessary updates in the SEASWEB system.

The following chart provides a summary discussion of the improvement activities undertaken during 2011-2012. PRDE will continue with these activities in 2012-2013.

Activity	Discussion
1. Include training to regular teachers and personnel as part of the Statewide Personnel Development System.	<p>This is an on-going activity.</p> <p>PRDE SAAE's Technical Assistance (TA) Unit continuously provides technical assistance throughout the year, including various training sessions. These trainings cover areas for teachers, Regional Facilitators, and School Facilitators regarding accommodations, equitable services for students with disabilities, development of IEPs, post-secondary transition, strategies for teaching special education students in an inclusive classroom, and other topics related to specific disabilities.</p> <p>PRDE will continue this effort.</p>
2. Include training for special education teachers and staff as part of the Statewide Personnel Development System.	See discussion in #1 above.
3. Continue to monitor provision of appropriate special education services in schools.	The TA Unit provides support to teachers and school personnel after the Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) identifies concerns in the provision of FAPE. The TA Unit also provides support based on information received from other aspects of SAAE's generally supervision system, including the State Complaint and Due Process components. PRDE will continue this activity.
4. Increase special education support to students; accommodations, modifications, materials, equipment, assistive technology and related services.	During the FFY 2011 PRDE maintained the use of its financial system ('SIFDE' by its acronym in Spanish) which provides a field that that allows student identification recording within each AT purchase request. This field allows PRDE SAAE to track and monitor the status of AT equipment orders from the time of requisition to actual delivery of the equipment.

Activity	Discussion
	<p>This also enhances PRDE SAEE communication with the PRDE Procurement Office to ensure timely purchase and delivery of equipment.</p> <p>School Facilitators were trained on the process to ensure that student identification numbers are recorded in each of the AT purchase requests at the school level.</p> <p>At the school level, the School Facilitator is in charge of supporting the school personnel, including providing support to students regarding accommodations and modifications. Regarding assistive technology equipment, the School Facilitator has the responsibility of purchasing this equipment directly from the school through the SIFDE system or with the PCards. This makes the process more accessible for the parents and students.</p> <p>The District Facilitators are responsible for making on-site visits to schools to provide technical assistance, as requested.</p> <p>PRDE will continue this effort.</p>
<p>5. Increase special education support to personnel; technical assistance, consultations, best practices information dissemination.</p>	<p>This is a continuous and on-going activity.</p> <p>Also see discussion in #1 above.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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.

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

Measurement:

A. 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.

B. 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

PRDE collects data on student placements. This information is uploaded and stored in PRDE's special education information system database and used for the 618 data submission. The data reported for this indicator are taken from Table 3, IDEA Implementation of FAPE requirements. The raw data and measurement calculations leading to the FFY 2011 calculations, which shall serve as PRDE's baseline for Indicators 6A and 6B, are provided below.

Baseline Data from FFY 2011:

6A: 71.92%

6B: 0.77%

Indicator 6A Data and Measurement

Total # of Children aged 3-5 with IEPs	(A1) # of children attending a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours per week and receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in a the regular early childhood program.	(B1) # of Children attending a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours per week and receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services the regular early childhood program
14,791	10,638	0

# 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 (A1+ B1)	(A1 + B1) divided by total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs	X 100
10,638	0.7192	71.92%

Indicator 6B Data and Measurement

Total # of Children with IEPs	# of children attending a special education program (NOT in any regular early childhood program), specifically, a...		
	(C1) Separate Special Education Class	(C2) a Separate School	(C3) a Residential Facility
14,791	114	0	0

# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility (C1 +C2 C3)	(C1 + C2 + C3) divided by total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs	X 100
114	0.0077	0.77%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

To validate the accuracy of the data for this indicator PRDE generated continuous data reports that were sent to the Regional Facilitators, CSEE Directors, and the School Facilitators. These personnel were then responsible for verifying the placement data and making any necessary updates in the SEASWEB system. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2012 before both the February 15, 2013 initial submission and the May 17, 2013 clarifications submission.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	<p><i>New baselines were established:</i></p> <p>Indicator 6A: 71.92%</p> <p>Indicator 6B: 0.77%</p>
2012 (2012-2013)	<p>Indicator 6A: Maintain Baseline (71.952%)</p> <p>Indicator 6B: Maintain Baseline (0.757%)</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

Improvement Activities	Timeline	Resources
<p>1. Include preschool services best practices in Statewide Professional Development System to train personnel from school districts and regions regarding preschool services in typical environments.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>PRDE Special Education Personnel APNI SERRC and DAC</p>
<p>2. Continue monitoring the implementation of the interagency agreements with Part C for a smooth transition process of preschools that exit Early Intervention Services and are eligible to Part B Services.</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>PRDE Special Education Personnel With the Department of Health Personnel</p>
<p>3. Continue monitoring the implementation of the Interagency Agreement with Early Head Start and Head Start Programs to promote and increase appropriate transition to school services.</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>PRDE Special Education Personnel Early Head Start and Head Start Programs Personnel</p>
<p>4. Updating and disseminating information of pre-school services</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>PRDE Special Education Personnel</p>
<p>5. Revise the Pre-school Memorandum, which establishes the activities to be held in order to guarantee a smooth transition process and the criteria for the eligibility.</p>	<p>Annually</p>	<p>PRDE Special Education Coordinator and other personnel as necessary</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: 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))

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 **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.

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.

Measurable and Rigorous Target and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Targets and Actual Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2011 (2011-2012)

Summary Statements	Target FFY 2011 (% of children)	Actual FFY 2011 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. 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 exited the program	95.1%	87.6%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program	56.8%	60.6%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. 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 exited the program	90.3%	88.9%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program	49.4%	58.0%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. 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 exited the program	96%	90.8%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program	77%	71.5%

Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2011

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	45	2.4%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	169	9.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	512	27.8%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,005	54.6%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	110	6.0%
Total	N= 1,841	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	45	2.4%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	147	8.0%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	581	31.6%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	960	52.1%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	108	5.9%
Total	N=1,841	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	38	2.0%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	107	5.8%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	379	20.6%

d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,045	56.8%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	272	14.8%
Total	N=1,841	100%

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

As discussed in Puerto Rico’s SPP, all children ages 3 through 5, upon receiving special education services for the first time, are included in the data collection process for Indicator 7. This process begins by completing the *Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar* (a translation of ECO’s COSF). When the child exits preschool services, after having received services for more than six months, exit data is gathered using the same document (again, the *Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar*) to determine the child’s outcomes in accordance with this indicator’s measurement.

To improve the data collection process for this indicator, SAEЕ provided each CSEE with the list of students with disabilities who exited the preschool program during FFY 2011, from its special education information system database. The CSEEs then validated their lists and gathered the required information for the exiting students for submission to SAEЕ Central Level.

The CSEEs were responsible for submitting the summary forms for their students to the SAEЕ Central Level, where the data was tabulated and analyzed by staff in the SAEЕ Technical Assistance (TA) Unit. Because PRDE uses the ECO COSF, the criteria for defining ‘comparable to same-aged peers’ has been defined as a child who has been assigned a core of 6 or 7 on the survey.

Actual Target Data Discussion for (FFY 2011):

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Summary Statement 1: During FFY 2011, 87.6% of those children who entered **or exited** the program below age expectations in positive socio-emotional skills (including social relationships) substantially increased their rate of growth in positive socio-emotional skills by the time they exited. The FFY 2011 data reflects slippage as compared to FFY 2010 (90.5%) (a decrease of 2.9 percentage points), but an increase of 1.5% as compared to FFY 2009 data (86.1%). PRDE did not meet the FFY 2011 target (95.1%).

Summary Statement 2: During FFY 2011, 60.6% of children who were functioning within age expectations in positive social-emotional skills by the time they exited. The State exceeded its FFY 2011 target (56.8%) but showed slippage (-1.92 percentage points) compared to the FFY 2010 data (62.52%).

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy)

Summary Statement 1: During FFY 2011, 88.9% of those children who entered **or exited** the program below age expectations in acquiring and using knowledge and skills substantially increased their rate of growth in acquiring and using knowledge and skills by the time they exited. Data compared to FFY 2010 (87.97%) showed progress (an increase of 0.93 percentage points) but just missed the FFY 2011 target (90.3%).

Summary Statement 2: During FFY 2011, 58.0% of children were functioning within age expectations in acquiring and using knowledge and skills by the time they exited. The State exceeded its FFY 2011 target (49.4%) and remained consistent with FFY 2010 data (58.14%) (a slight decrease of 0.14 percentage points).

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Summary Statement 1: During FFY 2011, 90.8% of those children who entered **or exited** the program below age expectations in taking appropriate action to meet needs substantially increased their rate of growth taking appropriate action to meet needs by the time they exited. Data compared to FFY 2010 (92.99%) showed slippage (a decrease of 2.19 percentage points), missing the FFY 2011 target (96%).

Summary Statement 2: During FFY 2011, 71.5% of children were functioning within age expectations in taking appropriate action to meet needs by the time they exited. Data compared to FFY 2010 (73.37%) reflected slippage (in a decrease of 1.87 percentage points) and missed the FFY 2011 target (77%).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

The following chart provides information on the accomplishments, progress, of the activities proposed in the SPP for the implementation of this indicator.

Improvement Activities	Discussion
<p>1. Develop and implement strategies (memos, follow up calls, on site visits) to increase students matching between Special Education Information System(SEASWEB) of exited students and the Outcomes Summary Format Results received from preschool children as exiting preschool services</p>	<p>PRDE' continues periodical meetings with Part C to ensure the implementation with the Part Agreement and also to increase students matching between Part C to Part B.</p>
<p>2. Develop and implement guidelines to verify data collection and data entry.</p>	<p>As reported in previous APRs, PRDE created a guide based on its written instructions for the collection and submission of data related to Indicator 7. The guide, <i>Guía para la Entrada de los Datos y Verificación de la Recolección en los Resultados de la Intervención del Niño Pre-escolar</i>, was released in March 2011. Continuous trainings have been provided as need.</p>
<p>3. Develop and implement a Procedures Manual to implement the pre-school outcomes.</p>	<p>The Procedures Manual (<i>Guía de Procedimiento</i>), as discussed in the FFY 2010 APR, was issued and implemented in December 2010. Additionally, orientation meetings were held regarding the document.</p>
<p>4. Revise and disseminate the Outcomes Summary Format in order to incorporate recommendations and redesign its content to make it more users friendly.</p>	<p>In November and December 2010, PRDE reviewed and revised the form for collecting the data for Indicator 7. The modifications were based on addressing recommendations and experiences from collecting the data the prior year.</p> <p>It was determined that no further revisions were needed in 2011-2012.</p>

Improvement Activities	Discussion
5. Develop routine and annual training and technical assistance regarding data collection for this indicator to preschool teachers and other relevant personnel.	Training and technical assistance were provided in order to collect data from this Indicator. After receiving indicator data were reviewed to ensure that they were valid and reliable.
6. Provide training, materials, and technical assistance to preschool teachers and other relevant personnel regarding intervention strategies and models to provide quality preschool services.	Orientations were provided to pres-school personnel on improving results of preschool interventions and to train new personnel. From the 2010 needs study which identified specialized materials and items to enhance educational settings for students with disabilities, including self-contained classrooms and classrooms that focus work on children with autism. Various pre-school and autism classrooms received new equipment that made the classroom more appropriate for the students needs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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.

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

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	89.9%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 88%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Review of Process

For FFY 2011, PRDE continued with the same process for collection of data for Indicator 8 as described in its SPP submitted February 1, 2010. Therein, PRDE explained that it was using the *Inventario para Padres de Estudiantes que Reciben Servicios de Educación Especial*, a Spanish translation based on the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring’s Parent Survey—Special Education (version 2). This survey was translated, adapted and used to measure parent involvement in their children’s special education services for use in 2005-2006. For 2006-2007, some grammatical changes were made to the version used in 2005-2006 but no substantive changes were made. Since that time, no changes have been made to the survey. All questions, substantive areas, and information requested remain the same as approved by OSEP.

The parent inventory addresses three means for facilitating parental involvement: (i) schools as facilitator of the process, (ii) the teachers as facilitators, and (iii) a third scale related to the general view of the special education program. Parents who answered “bastante” or “mucho” (numbers 4 and number 5 on a 1 to 5 scale) on questions regarding parental involvement were counted as reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results of children with disabilities.

FFY 2011 Sample

A random selection of parents was used for survey administration. As PRDE's special education population for FFY 2011 was 129,314 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2011-2012.

Determination of the required sample was defined by the following formula:

$$s = \frac{X^2NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2P(1-P)}$$

Where:

s = required sample size

X² = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841)

N = population size

P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05)

Accordingly, with a universe/population size (N) of 129,314:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \frac{(3.841)(129,314)(.50)(1-.50)}{(.05)^2(129,314-1) + (3.841)(.50)(1-.50)} \\ &= \frac{(248,347.53)(.50)}{(.0025)(129,313) + .96025} \\ &= \frac{124,173.76}{323.2825 + .96025} \\ &= \frac{124,173.76}{324.2427} \\ &= 382.96 \\ s &= 383 \text{ parents} \end{aligned}$$

As such, in order to have sufficient sample size, PRDE was required to issue surveys to at least 383 parents.

The parents of a total of 383 students with disabilities were selected by the sampling method to receive the inventory. A total of 285 of the 383 parents selected for the sample completed and

returned inventories. This constitutes a 74% participation rate of the sample group. This survey depends absolutely on parent responses.

PRDE's sampling method allows for the collection of feedback from a wide variety of parents including variation and representation by school level, student placement and almost all types of disabilities. The response group was representative of the population.

Survey Results for FFY 2011

A total of 251 of the 285 completed surveys reported that schools facilitated parental involvement as a means to improving services and outcomes for their children with disabilities. This represents 88% of the respondent parents (251/285 x 100).

Data Year	(1) # respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	(2) # of respondent parents of children with disabilities	[(1)/(2)] X 100 = Percent
2011-2012	251	285	88%

PRDE did not meet the target of 89.9 percent for FFY 2009, 2010 and 2011. PRDE was one target of 88 percent for 2011. This are increment of 6 percent. PRDE did, however, see a 3% improvement in this Indicator for FFY 2009, up from 82% in FFY 2008 and 2010 to 85% in FFY 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Activities proposed for this year were held as established for Indicator 8. The table below summarizes improvement activities carried out during FFY 2012.

Activity	Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed
1. Revise and modify the survey	As discussed above, PRDE employed the same survey document previously approved by OSEP last year. The survey document was reviewed, and it was determined that no changes were required this year.
2. Increase parental responses to the survey	<p>PRDE implemented many activities and efforts in attempt to increase the parental responses to participation in the survey. PRDE central level staff worked directly with general supervisors who share the responsibility of informing selected parents of the survey and following up to ensure the surveys were received and returned. Parents have the option to return the completed surveys by mail or through the schools. For the FFY 2011 survey, PRDE extended the due date for the survey in an attempt to receive more surveys.</p> <p>The percentage of parents who responded to the survey increase of 66 percent (2010) to 74 percent this year, as compared to FFY 2010. However, participation for FFY 2009 (57%), was higher in FFY 2009 (66%), as compared to years prior to FFY 2008. As discussed in the FFY 2008 APR, PRDE saw a significant increase in participation with the FFY 2008 survey.</p>

Activity	Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed
3. Disseminate the results of the parent survey to regions and central level and other interested parties.	The results of the survey were disseminated through the general education supervisors who have the responsibility to keep the district supervisors, the school directors, and teachers informed. Several meetings addressing the parent survey were conducted through the regions. Agendas for these meetings included time for discussion of survey results, recommendations for improvement with this indicator, and some recommended activities to foster parent involvement.
4. Training and technical assistance to school and district personnel on facilitating parental involvement	As discussed above, PRDE included training and technical assistance along with its dissemination of the survey results to school and district personnel.
5. Foster joint parent/teacher trainings	<p>PRDE has worked to ensure there are plenty of opportunities for parents to be involved not only in mandatory activities such as IEP revisions and other procedures but also to learn more from SAEE, learn new information, and collaborate and truly feel as fully participating and collaborating partners. In addition to OSEP requirements for parental participation, the State Legal Case of Rosa Lydia Vélez requests evidence of these efforts as well. Parents are invited to participate and to collaborate. Their perspectives are very much appreciated from PRDE as PRDE recognizes the value of parents' perspectives and the importance of their participation. The following are examples of joint parent/teacher trainings during FFY 2011.</p> <p>The SAEE and the Secretary of Education worked in various activities in coordination with the Parents of the Comité Timón, the <i>Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial</i>, Comité of Secretary of Education, Alianza de Autismo and the National Association of Deaf-Blind Families. For example, they're participated of the disseminated the services, the selection and trainings of Special Education School Facilitators in the schools.</p> <p>In collaboration with APNI (Asociación de Padres con Niños con Impedimentos), PRDE sponsored two annual island wide activities that are joint parent/teacher trainings. Each year a different topic is covered in those meetings and a large amount of parents and teachers participate in and benefit from this activity. During this FFY 2011, was held at the Caribe Hilton Hotel in San Juan, Puerto Rico and was called "Optando por la inclusión: esfuerzo colaborativo entre la familia, la escuela y la comunidad" (Opting for inclusion: collaborative effort between family, school and community).</p> <p>Evaluations conducted and commentaries from the parents reflected parent's satisfaction and willingness to support these kinds of efforts. As such, PRDE plans to continue with such activities and joint trainings.</p>
6. Monitor the implementation of the established procedures for fostering parent involvement.	During FFY 2011, PRDE continued the use of a district self-assessment instrument as a means of PRDE's monitoring the implementation of the established PRDE procedures and policies. The theme of parent involvement is included in the monitoring.

Activity	Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed
<p>7. Administer the survey, collect data and measure progress on parent involvement</p>	<p>Completed for FFY 2011.</p> <p>For FFY 2011, PRDE decided to adjust the timing of the survey administration, collection, analysis, etc. As soon as the official child count data is submitted, the process of defining and selecting the sample begins (March, 2012). PRDE began distributing the survey in April, 2012 and aimed to complete administration of the survey by May, 2012. As referenced above, however, PRDE decided, on one occasions, to extend the deadline for submission of the parent surveys as an effort to increase participation.</p> <p>PRDE aims to have the parent surveys complete and be ready to share results by the month of August, 2012. August is PRDE's back-to-school month, and many meetings and trainings take place during the first days of school. This is a good opportunity for disseminating the information to schools and to reinforce through recommended activities the importance of parent and teacher collaboration.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

PRDE plans to continue with its currently state Improvement Activities. No revisions are being sought at this time for proposed targets either.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

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.

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2009, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' 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 2010 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2011. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 2011-2012</i>	N/A

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

As discussed in the SPP and reinforced by OSEP’s Puerto Rico Part B SPP/APR Response Table, this indicator does not apply to Puerto Rico.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

N/A (see above).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

N/A (see above).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
--

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2009, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2010, i.e., after June 30, 2011. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 2011-2012</i>	N/A

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

As discussed in the SPP and reinforced by OSEP’s Puerto Rico Part B SPP/APR Response Table, this indicator does not apply to Puerto Rico.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

N/A (see above).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

N/A (see above).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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.

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

<p>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.</p>
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 89.2% for timely evaluation (30 days).

Evaluations conducted within 30 days

Date Year	a. # of children with parental consent to evaluate	b. # of evaluations held within 30 days	% evaluations held within PR timeline (b/a)
2011-2012	22,650	20,204	<u>89.2%</u>

*A total of 22,965 children with parental consent to evaluate were initially received, however 315 students exited the registration process prior to receiving their initial evaluations.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

As noted in Puerto Rico’s SPP, PRDE faces State timelines shorter than the federal requirements due to the RLV court case sentence which mandates compliance of 30 days for initial evaluations. Because of these State established timelines; Puerto Rico reports its actual target data for this indicator using its timeline of 30 days.

During FFY 2011, a total of 22,650 students were referred for and had parental consent to evaluate. Of that number, 20,204, which represents 89.2% of all students referred for initial evaluation with parental consent, received a timely initial evaluation (i.e., within 30 days). As such, PRDE did not meet the mandatory 100% target. While the data reflects minor slippage as compared to FFY 2010 (a decrease of 2.3 percentage points) PRDE saw a significant increase in the number of children with parental consent to evaluate for FFY 2011. This year the number of students requiring initial evaluation increased by 4,791 students as compared to FFY 2010. PRDE was able to maintain a high level of compliance with its 30-day evaluation timeline despite this increase in its initial evaluation caseload.

FFY 2011 Data Re: Those Children Referred but Not Evaluated within Timeline

The following charts report the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined as requested by OSEP.

Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate	Eval. within 30 days or less	Eval. within 60 days	Eval. within 90 days	Eval. within 120 days	Eval., possibly in more than 120 days
22,650	20,204	1,641	408	186	211
	89.2%	7.3%	1.8%	.8%	0.9%

As reflected above, PRDE completed 96.5% of FFY 2011 initial evaluations within 60 days.

One major change for FFY 2011 was PRDE’s efforts to move the evaluation and determination process closer to students by shifting the primary responsibility for arranging and carrying out initial evaluations from the CSEEs to the schools. PRDE’s 1,294 School Facilitators, who were hired during FFY 2010, played a key role in this transition. They have served as the primary point of contact and process initiator in a variety of activities. The School Facilitators receive training in the following areas: child find, registration, evaluation, eligibility determination, IEP, placement, transportation services, related services, assistive technology, IDEA program requirements, and use of information systems. In order to aid in providing a more expeditious processing and addressing of the needs of the population the special education program serves, PRDE provided a significant number of technological tools to the School Facilitators.

During FFY 2011, PRDE continued with its updated system for scheduling initial evaluation appointments, which has aided PRDE in its efforts to ensure initial evaluations to those students identified as potential participants of special education services are promptly scheduled and held timely. This system, which maintains an individual electronic data bank of available appointments including the date/time by service provider, records the appointment made for the student’s evaluation using the student identification number. This allows for proper identification and tracking of appointments made, as well as follow-up for reports on initial evaluations pending from service providers, improving PRDE’s controls over ensuring compliance with the 30-day timeline. This system

is used at the Service Centers and is also another tool that the School Facilitators uses to request and follow-up on initial evaluations of students attending their schools.

As an established procedure that has been in place since 2007-2008, PRDE continues to require contractors providing initial evaluations to present a report which includes: evaluations conducted and services provided, student dismissals, parental requests to transfer their services from one corporation to another, and referrals not attended. PRDE has continued the policy by which corporations are issued monetary sanctions when there is a delay of more than 10 days between the evaluation and submission of the evaluation report to the Service Center. Additionally, the SAEЕ Monitoring and Compliance Unit monitors compliance with these items. These requirements were included in the contracts signed by service providers and have contributed to the provision of timely services for PRDE.

During FFY 2011, PRDE maintained a taskforce to assist with data validation and overall support at CSEEs facing the significant challenges with compliance indicators, including Indicator 11. PRDE identified the CSEEs in need of support by regularly generating and analyzing monthly data reports for performance at each of the CSEEs (see discussion of Improvement Activity #4 in the activities chart for more information regarding the monthly report efforts). Members of the taskforce have provided on-site support at those CSEEs to assist with the file reviews. The activities performed by the taskforce have included both technical assistance and training to information system staff to improve their performance in reviewing data, validation, and entering information into the system. On-site assistance included a thorough review of files on follow-up visits to the CSEEs, school districts and schools, to verify that all the information of initial evaluation was updated in the information system database. For students who had received their initial evaluations, the supporting documentation was added to the CSEE file and updated accordingly in the database. For students who had not yet received an initial evaluation, evaluation appointments were made immediately.

Correction of Noncompliance Reflected in the FFY 2010 APR

PRDE notes that in its FFY 2010 APR, PRDE reported that all initial evaluation requests for FFY 2010 had been verified as completed, even if beyond the 30 day timeline, **by the time of the FFY 2010 APR submission.** As such, there is no outstanding noncompliance from FFY 2010 for which PRDE had not already reported upon which reporting would be required for Indicator 11. Nonetheless, for consistency in format of reporting as compared to past years, PRDE herein includes a description of the correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 APR under Indicator 11.⁵

PRDE has verified the timely correction of 100% of incidents of noncompliance connected to Indicator 11 in the FFY 2010 APR. PRDE has ensured that 100% of students with parental consent to receive initial evaluations during FFY 2010 were evaluated. Below, PRDE provides a table of APR data for Indicator 11 from the FFY 2010 APR clarification submission as a point of reference. The data from this submission was extrapolated to reflect how many initial evaluations were not completed within 30 days and which PRDE needed to verify had been completed.

⁵ Although Puerto Rico is reporting FFY 2010 data that were less than 100%, no findings of noncompliance were issued in FFY 2010 for an appropriate reason. During the second semester of FFY 2009, PRDE SAEЕ's Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) conducted monitoring visits to all 9 of Puerto Rico's CSEEs. The MCU issued findings of noncompliance regarding Indicator 11 to all nine of the CSEEs. Because these findings were issued in late FFY 2009, the findings remained open, and within the one year timeline for correction, at the start of FFY 2010. As such, the MCU continued monitoring compliance with Indicator 11 requirements as part of its efforts to verify the correction of noncompliance in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. PRDE discussed this issue with OSEP and verified that it would be neither necessary nor appropriate to issue a new finding in a given area against an entity while such entity had an open finding (i.e., a finding pending verification of correction) in the same area. These FFY 2009 findings were included in PRDE's B-15 table of its FFY 2010 APR submission, which reflects the timely correction of noncompliance due during FFY 2010 (i.e., timely correction of findings identified during FFY 2009), and are discussed further in PRDE's Supplemental Report submitted with this FFY 2011 APR submission.

<u>APR Indicator 11 Data</u>	<u>a. Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate</u>	<u>b. Timely evaluated (within 30 days)</u>	<u>Percent of timely (within 30 days) evaluation (b/a)</u>
<u>FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</u>	<u>17,859</u>	<u>16,434</u>	<u>92.02%</u>

PRDE has assured the timely correction of non-compliance, i.e., has assured the outstanding evaluations have been completed, as reflected by the below table.

<u>Correction of Non-compliance Data</u>	<u>c. Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate that did not receive timely (within 30 days) evaluations (a-b)</u>	<u>d. Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate that received evaluations after 30 days (as reported in the FFY 2010 APR)</u>	<u>e. Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate that were remaining to be verified as evaluated at the time of the FFY 2010 APR clarification submission (c-d)</u>	<u>f. Total # of children in 'e' that PRDE has verified have received their initial evaluation or otherwise exited the system</u>	<u>Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate that did not receive timely (within 30 days) evaluations that have since received initial evaluations ((d+f)/c)</u>
<u>FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</u>	<u>1,425</u>	<u>1,425</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>100%</u>

In assuring verification of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 APR, PRDE's work has been consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. PRDE conducted a review of updated data to determine proper implementation of 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) and 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 Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The verification of correction of noncompliance was timely, i.e., within one year of identification.

Updated Data

The FFY 2012 Special Conditions require PRDE to report on updated data for the period from July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 with the FFY 2011 APR. Accordingly, PRDE has included this updated data in its APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with this FFY 2011 APR.

Improvement Activities Table

The table below summarizes improvement activities carried out during FFY 2011.

ACTIVITY	Discussion of Progress of activities completed
1. Implement the eligibility determination pilot in the remaining Service Centers.	The eligibility determination project has completed its pilot implementation stages; the practice is on-going. The eligibility determination pilot program, conceived in 2006-2007, has been implemented in all CSEEs island wide. The Determination of Eligibility Unit is in place at all Service Centers. The teams are responsible for initial evaluation coordination and analysis, including eligibility determination through to IEP meeting coordination with the student's school. This includes providing orientation to parents who come to the CSEEs to register their student for special education. For more information, see discussions under Indicator 11 in prior APR submissions.
2. Evaluated options and develop guidelines for dealing with parents who miss their appointments	As previously reported, PRDE adopted and has in place a procedure related to repeated failure to attend scheduled appointments for evaluations. PRDE's procedure eliminates students from registration list (i.e., the list of students awaiting initial evaluation) when parents have failed to bring their student to a scheduled evaluation appointment three consecutive times. This procedure was adopted in accordance with 34 CFR 300.301(d). Parents are informed of this procedure, and specifically that repeated failure to attend can result in exiting student from registration process, during the orientation they receive upon registering their student to receive special education services. PRDE has trained CSEE personnel and the School Facilitators regarding the registration process and the importance of the orienting parents on the importance of attending the initial evaluation and the result of failing to miss three consecutive appointments under this procedure.
3. Keep up working to implement the alert system in SEASWEB	During FFY 2011, PRDE implemented a SEASWEB alert system, which sends an automatic email to the staff assigned to the student before the expiration of the terms of evaluations, reevaluations, IEP, placement, and eligibility determination as well as the approaching the third birthday of children included in Indicator 12.
4. Use the information system to generate monthly report or the cases registered for better monitoring compliance	PRDE will continue with this activity. The Central Level generates monthly data reports for each Service Center during the first week of each month. These monthly data reports include information on performance under Indicator 11. The reports are retrieved from the system in order to monitor and provide technical assistance and support as needed. As a result of analyzing these monthly reports, PRDE established a task force to provide additional support to CSEEs for which the monthly reports reflected greater compliance challenges. More information regarding this task force is discussed above. Also another support is given by the School Facilitators at the school level.
5. Implement a new protocol for Eligibility Determination as proposed.	This is an ongoing activity. During FFY 2011, PRDE continued using the Eligibility Determination protocol that has been in place at the CSEEs.
6. Coordinate with P.R. P.T.A. (APNI) for parents orientation on procedures and timelines for services provision (B11,B12)	This is an ongoing activity. PRDE held quarterly meetings with the APNI personnel where focus was placed on the process of identifying students referred from Part C to Part B. Additionally, PRDE held individual meetings with APNI personnel specific to cases at the CSEE at which they were posted. Meetings addressed the importance of APNI personnel in the registration and

ACTIVITY	Discussion of Progress of activities completed
	eligibility determination processes as well as the constant entry and update of data in SEASWEB.

Revisions with Justification to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities timelines, or resources for this indicator at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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.

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

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 whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. 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)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2010 2011-2012</i>	<i>100%</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 91.2%

PRDE conducted island-wide data collection and several validation activities in order to obtain the number of children who exited Part C services whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthday, the number of children who were found eligible and were provided special education services by their third birthday, and the number of eligible children who, at the end of the period, had not been provided with special education services. The data collected shows the following.

Table A - Data

a- # of children served in Part C referred to Part B for eligibility determination	b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	c. # of children found eligible with IEP's developed and implemented by their third birthday	d. # of children for whom parental refusal to consent to evaluation caused delay in evaluation or initial services	e. # of children who were referred to Part B less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
1,468	37	1,277	31	0

Measurement:

Data Year	(a – b – d – e)	C Divided by (a-b-d-e)	Times 100	= Percent
2011-2012	1,468-37-31-0 = 1,400	1,277 / 1,400 = 0.912	0.912 X 100 = 91.2	91.2%

As directed by the measurement instructions for this indicator, children included in 'a' (from Table A above) but not included in 'b', 'c', 'd', or 'e' must be accounted for. There is a subgroup of 123 children included in 'a' (children served in Part C referred to Part B for eligibility determination) that are not included in 'b', 'c', 'd', or 'e'. Although this subgroup of students may not have received their eligibility determination and had Part B services in place by their third birthday, PRDE has confirmed that the entire subgroup has had their eligibility determination completed, and as appropriate, has services in place. The following table (Table B) provides the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of these 123 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

Table B. Range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday.

# of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2010 and were not determined eligible or provided with services on their third birthday	In place within 60 days of third birthday	In place within between 61 and 90 days or third birthday	In place within 91 and 120 days of third birthday	In place within more than 120 days of third birthday
123	95	12	6	10

Based on FFY 2011¹⁰ data, the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday is 1 – 205 days. Nearly all of the children served in Part C that were referred to Part B and determined eligible, 98%, were receiving services within 60 days of their third birthday. When a child's IEP was completed prior to the child's third birthday, services were provided. Reasons for the delays include the following: data entry errors,


new staff, parents failed to keep scheduled appointments, Part C failed to send transition meeting notices in a timely manner, and facilitators failed to attend transition meetings.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

PRDE’s efforts to improve compliance over the past several years are clearly reflected in the continuous and significant improvement in PRDE’s data for this indicator. The table below compares Puerto Rico’s performance under Indicator 12 over the past several years. A graphic below also demonstrates this progress with Indicator 12 performance.

Demonstrated Progress with Indicator 12 Over Time						
	<i>FFY 2006</i>	<i>FFY 2007</i>	<i>FFY 2008</i>	<i>FFY 2009</i>	<i>FFY 2010</i>	<i>FFY 2011</i>
Indicator 12 Measurement	21.9%	31.1%	38.7%	50.5%	75.0%	91.2%

Progress with Indicator 12 over time



The steps that PRDE is taking for the improvement of the services through the Special Education Service Centers, as well as the intensive training, guidance, and follow up provided to personnel in charge of the transition process has resulted in improved compliance with this requirement. PRDE has learned much about the transition process and has taken action resulting in great improvement with this indicator, breaking the 90% mark.

During 2011-2012, PRDE continued efforts to improve routine communications between Part C and Part B. These communications have identified challenges that both agencies are working to

address. PRDE will continue to meet with Part C staff. A Memorandum of Agreement between agencies has been finalized and signed to ensure collaboration, improvement activities and data exchange expectations.

For the Early Childhood transition agreements which are required by 34 CFR 303.209(a)(3)(i) of the IDEA Part C final regulations published on September 28, 2011 there have been several working sessions between representatives of both agencies to address the impact of such changes on the interagency agreement. Currently these meetings are taking place on a regular basis for both agencies to ensure that indeed the agreement contains all requirements as required by law.

PRDE maintained the placement of a Special Education Facilitator at each of the island's Special Education Service Centers who is assigned the responsibility of ensuring an agile process for transitioning children. This Facilitator, along with the preschool coordinators, are in charge of the follow up and coordination needed to evaluate, determine eligibility, develop the IEPs, and coordinate services. The Special Education Supervisors work hand in hand with representatives from APNI in efforts to ensure all children referred from Part C to Part B receive their eligibility determinations and begin receiving services, as appropriate, by their third birthday.

Throughout this year, PRDE continued the taskforce established in March 2010 to assist with data validation and overall support at CSEEs facing the significant challenges with compliance indicators, including Indicator 12. PRDE identified the CSEEs in need of support as a result of its practice of generating and analyzing monthly data reports for performance at each of the CSEEs (see discussion of Improvement Activity #4 in the activities chart for more information regarding the monthly report efforts). Members of the taskforce have provided on-site support at those CSEEs to assist with the review of files for the backlog of students referred from Part C who had not yet been reported in the data system as having received an initial evaluation. Taskforce activities have included both technical assistance and training to data system staff to improve their performance with data review, validation, and entry into the system as well as hands-on assistance reviewing the files and ensuring that students received initial evaluations and that data was updated accordingly in the system. For students who had received their initial evaluations, the supporting documentation was added to the CSEE file and updated accordingly in the Special Education System.

Taskforce efforts have been successful as reflected in the significant progress with this indicator over the past year as well as PRDE's ability to confirm 100% of students referred from Part C to Part B during FFY 2011 have received their eligibility determination, and where appropriate, have begun receiving services.

Correction of Noncompliance Reflected in the FFY 2010 APR

In its FFY 2010 APR, PRDE reported that all students referred from Part C to Part B during FFY 2010 received their eligibility determinations and provision of services, where appropriate, even if beyond the student's third birthday. As such, there is no outstanding noncompliance from FFY 2010 for which PRDE has not already reported. Nonetheless, for consistency in format of reporting as compared to past year, PRDE has included a discussion of the correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 APR.

Puerto Rico has assured the timely correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2010 APR under Indicator 12, early childhood transition. As of the FFY 2010 APR, PRDE reported that it was unable to evidence a total of 387 students referred from Part C to Part B received their eligibility determinations and provision of services, where appropriate, by the student's third birthday. PRDE was able to confirm that 100% of those 387 students had been evaluated and, where appropriate, were receiving services, as of the FFY 2010 APR submission. As such, PRDE verified that all of those children referred from Part C to Part B have been evaluated, received eligibility determinations and—where determined eligible—had an IEP developed and implemented. In all cases, this correction was verified in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of the identification of noncompliance.

Puerto Rico also assured the timely correction of all findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 12 that were identified during FFY 2010. As a unitary system, PRDE's monitoring approach throughout FFY 2010 included on-site visits to school districts to monitor for compliance with early childhood transition requirements (Indicator 12). During FFY 2010, two school districts were issued a finding of noncompliance with regard to Indicator 12. Both findings were verified as being corrected timely, within one year of identification. These findings are included in PRDE's B-15 table of this APR submission, which reflects the timely correction of noncompliance due during FFY 2011.

In assuring verification of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 APR, PRDE's work has been consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. PRDE conducted a review of updated data to determine proper implementation of 34 CFR 300.124(b) and has completed the evaluation, for any child referred from Part C to Part B whose initial evaluation, and where appropriate, provision of services were not provided by the child's third birthday, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Improvement Activities Chart

The following chart provides information on the accomplishments, progress, and slippages of the activities proposed in the SPP for the implementation of this indicator.

Activity	Discussion
<p>1. Create an alert in the information system for when child is about to turn 3 years old. Work to ensure such an alert functions in an efficient and effective manner.</p>	<p>This tool helps PRDE keep track of the compliance with this indicator. The alert helps the personnel to be directly aware of the expiration date. This has helped contribute to the progress with this indicator for 2011-2012.</p>
<p>2. Use the information system to generate a monthly report of the cases registered in order to better monitor compliance.</p>	<p>During FFY 2011, PRDE continued improving its referral process for children referred from Part C to Part B. As a part of that continuing improvement, PRDE received technical assistance from DAC and SERRC.</p> <p>The Puerto Rico Department of Health, which oversees IDEA Part C on the island, sends a monthly report on all children referred from Part C to Part B to PRDE SAEE (Central Level). PRDE SAEE then distributes these monthly reports to the CSEEs. The coordinators of preschool services review the monthly reports, in collaboration with the directors of CSEE, and provide the necessary follow-up activities.</p> <p>Throughout 2011-2012, PRDE continued work with a contractor, ProInfo, to provide additional technical assistance at the CSEEs. These efforts will continue as they have proven to ensure accurate and reliable data for this indicator.</p>

Activity	Discussion
<p>3. Provide additional continuous training and technical assistance to personnel at locations with greater challenges in compliance with this indicator in order to address issues specific to such locations.</p>	<p>This is an ongoing activity. Trainings were provided to address specific areas of concern, including the data collection and entry processes. PRDE held several training sessions and provided technical assistance to personnel from the Central Level, the CSEEs, and the districts to ensure compliance with this indicator. Some of these technical assistance activities were provided in coordination with DAC and SERRC.</p> <p>Meetings were held with the APNI project coordinator to address any issues of validation or updating the information in the data system. Through this collaborative effort, the APNI coordinators at each CSEE assist with locating the impacted students and ensuring initial evaluations are scheduled, take place, and data is updated accordingly in the system. Collaboration between PRDE and APNI is continuous and ongoing.</p>
<p>4. Evaluate and identify best practices for monitoring transition in coordination with both the Monitoring and Technical Assistance Units.</p>	<p>Part C to Part B transition is monitored by the MCU during its on-site monitoring visits. PRDE monitored entities for compliance with this indicator, provided onsite technical assistance, and scheduled follow-up visits to ensure correction of identified noncompliance.</p> <p>The SAEЕ Monitoring Unit shares its monitoring reports with the SAEЕ Technical Assistance Unit, allowing the Technical Assistance Unit to use the monitoring information to improve delivery and content of technical assistance services and ensures that the TA Unit addresses the issues identified through the monitoring process.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities timelines, or resources for this indicator at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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 service's 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))

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 (2011-2012)</i>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: ~~100%~~ **99.6%**

The following chart summarizes the data for calculating Puerto Rico's actual measurement for FFY 2011. Of the 12,447 files reviewed, ~~12,447~~ **11,528** met the secondary transition requirements in accordance with Indicator B-13. As such, PRDE's actual target data for FFY 2011 is in compliance with ~~100%~~ **92.6%**. Data regarding the number of those students who have an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals was determined through the process described below.

a. # of IEPs of students age 16 and above reviewed	b. # of students included in (a) with IEPs that include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals	% of students with transition goals in their IEP (b/a)
12,447	12,447 11,528	92.6% 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

PRDE established its baseline data for this indicator in FFY 2009. The baseline data measures the percent of students 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 service's needs.

PRDE determines whether or not a student has appropriate measurable postsecondary goals by reviewing student files and completing a certification form, which includes a Spanish-language checklist that was developed using the B13 Checklist created by the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). The current certification form is nearly identical to the form discussed in Puerto Rico's FFY 2010 APR. As discussed therein, one question was added for data collection requirements at the State level. Additionally, for FFY 2011, minor changes were made to clarify confusion the teachers and facilitators had regarding transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies (former questions seven and eight). These questions have been revised and included as the new question seven. A copy of the certification form used for FFY 2011 is included at Attachment B. Information was collected in accordance with the checklist and school directors were required to provide signatures assuring the reliability of the information.

PRDE's efforts to obtain and validate data for this indicator included the following activities:

- A list was prepared of student's age 16 years and above who were required to have transition services in their IEPs. This list was created based on data in PRDE's special education information system for the entire reporting year. The corresponding lists were sent to each CSEE for validation, and data update as necessary. The final updated lists then served as the master list for reviewing files.
- The file of each student on the list was reviewed and checklist verified. CSEE Directors worked with their staff, including transition coordinators, to complete the verification for each student file. All staff involved in this review process was trained in the use of this checklist in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.
- Special Education School Facilitators were in charge of reviewing the files and initially completing the transition checklist for this indicator, in coordination with the SAEE Transition Coordinators.
- SAEE Transition Coordinators were in charge of training staff and monitoring the use of the checklist. Transition Coordinators are also involved in the IEP development and revision process. In total, PRDE reviewed the files of ~~42,934~~ 12,447 students age 16 and above.

The following table lists the checklist certification results. All questions included in the summary below, 1-9, are considered in determining whether the student's IEP includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals in accordance with Indicator 13. As detailed in the instructions to the checklist, the response to each applicable question must be 'yes' in order to answer the final question, regarding compliance with Indicator B-13, in the affirmative. The overall data collected by the checklist application shows as follows:

Transition IEP Checklist Results For 2011-2012	Yes	No	N/A
1. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age- appropriate transition assessments?	12,447,347	0,100	N/A
2. Are there measurable postsecondary goals that address education or training, employment, and (as needed) independent living?	12,447,235	0,212	N/A
3. Is/are there annual IEP goals that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals?	12,447,334	0,116	N/A
4. Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate movement from school to post-school?	12,447,496	0,254	N/A
5. Do the transition services include a course of study with focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate movement from school to post-school?	12,447,207	0,240	N/A
6. Do transition services include student participation in academic courses, vocational or technical, which contribute to achieving postsecondary goals?	12,447,083	0,364	N/A
<p>7. Was it necessary for other agencies to participate in the IEP team meeting? If so, mark which agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Labor o Recreation and Sports, Department of Health o Department of the Family, Technical School o University, Consortiums <p>Other(s): _____</p> <p>If the answer is 'yes', proceed to answering questions 7(a) and 7(b). If 'no', proceed to question 8.</p> <p>7(a) Is there evidence that representatives of the agency (ies) were invited to the IEP team meeting?</p> <p>7(b) Is there evidence that representatives of the agency (ies) participated in the IEP team meeting?</p>	10,129	2,318	N/A
8. Is there evidence that the student was invited to participate in the development of his or her IEP to include transition services for the current academic year?	12,447,985	0,462	N/A
Does the IEP contain the established legal requisites to comply with Indicator B-13 (in accordance with checklist instructions)	12,447,415,528	0,919	N/A

NOTE: As of the time of PRDE's initial APR clarifications submission opportunity (May 8, 2013), PRDE is in the process of verifying that the 919 IEPs that did not contain the established legal requisites to comply with Indicator B-13 have been updated and are now in compliance with these requirements. In the event PRDE is able to complete its verification work by the final due date for the clarifications submission (May 17, 2013), PRDE intends to include this update.

PRDE has made significant improvement with this indicator ~~although~~ the data for FFY 2011 reflects ~~minor slippage/increase (down 4.23.2 percentage points)~~ as compared to FFY 2010. ~~PRDE's achieving actual measurement data of over 90% for two consecutive years for Indicator 13 reflects years of sustained hard work and dedication to ensuring all students receive services according to legal requirements.~~ The chart below reflects PRDE's actual measurement data with this indicator since setting the baseline in FFY 2009.

Data Year	FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	FFY 2011 (2011-2012)
% of students with transition goals in their IEP (b/a)	88.9%	95.8%	92.6% 100%

Correction of Noncompliance Reflected in the FFY 2010 APR

As per the FFY 2011 Part B Measurement Table, PRDE must report on the status of correction of non-compliance reflected in the FFY 2010 Indicator 13 data. PRDE reported less than 100% compliance with this indicator for FFY 2010. Specifically, PRDE reported that 15,260 of the 15,926 IEPs of students aged 16 and above reviewed were confirmed to include appropriate measureable postsecondary goals. As reflected in the following table, PRDE has verified the timely correction of 100% of the incidents of noncompliance connected to Indicator 13 for FFY 2010.

a. Number of student files reviewed for the FFY 2010 APR for which PRDE was not able to confirm as compliant with Indicator 13 (15,926 – 15,260)	b. Adjusted item 'a'*	c. Number of those files (item b) for which PRDE has verified as corrected	d. Number of those files for which PRDE was not able to verify as corrected	e. % Verified as Corrected
666	420 246	420	0	100%

*In PRDE's FFY 2010 APR, PRDE reported a total of 666 student files reviewed for which PRDE was not able to confirm as compliant with Indicator 13. Since that time, PRDE has identified that 246 of those 666 students have either exited the PRDE system or should not have been included in the review. This includes a small subset of students who PRDE determined were not yet 16 years of age and, as such, should not have been included in the review of this indicator.

To verify that that the necessary corrections of non-compliance had been made, PRDE staff in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Special Education (SAEE) met with Transition Facilitators to discuss the results of the Indicator 13 data and to develop a strategy for making necessary corrections. First, areas of non-compliance were identified and analyzed. A corrective action plan was then made for each case of non-compliance. The SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit then conducted an on-site visit to review each student file and ensure that the correction was made. In those instances where corrective action wasn't completed, additional corrective actions were required and subsequent monitoring visits were scheduled to ensure compliance. The required validation

process sheets for each file were reviewed and verified at the CSEE, and the CSEE was required to certify the correction results before submitting them to the SAEE central level.

Puerto Rico also assured the timely correction of all findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 13 that were identified during FFY 2010. As a unitary system, PRDE's monitoring approach throughout FFY 2010 included on-site visits to school districts to monitor for compliance with postsecondary transition goal requirements (Indicator 13). During FFY 2010, ten school districts were issued a finding of noncompliance with regard to Indicator 13. All ten findings were verified as being corrected timely, within one year of identification. These findings are included in PRDE's B-15 table of this APR submission, which reflects the timely correction of noncompliance due during FFY 2011.

In assuring verification of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 APR submission, PRDE's work has been consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. PRDE conducted a review of updated data to determine proper implementation of 34 CFR 300.320(b) and 300.321(b) and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance (i.e. ensured the IEPs of those students 16 and above included appropriate measurable postsecondary goals), unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Improvement Activities:

PRDE looks forward to improving compliance with this indicator in coming years, working towards 100% compliance with this indicator. PRDE's efforts with its planned improvement activities are detailed in the Improvement Activities chart below.

Activity	Discussion
1. Review the Transition Manual, make revisions as necessary.	PRDE's <i>Comité Consultivo</i> , the stakeholder advisory group, is in the process of reviewing the current version of the Transition Manual and will be making recommendations to the SAEE regarding improvements to make the manual more helpful and practical.
2. Continue and intensify monitoring to guarantee the services in the IEP; provide special attention in regions requiring additional assistance.	<p>After reviewing the results of the FFY 2010 APR, the SAEE Technical Assistance Unit prepared a technical assistance schedule for visiting the Arecibo, Bayamon and San Juan Regions. These regions were selected based on their lower performance with Indicator 13. During these on-site visits, the TA Unit introduced an Intervention Plan, which included strategies for addressing and correcting transition services established in Student IEPs.</p> <p>The on-site visits by the Technical Assistance focused on post-secondary transition services, IEP writing, creating measurable goals and proper execution of the process in order to ensure compliance. The TA Unit plan for 2012-2013 includes all regions in these efforts during 2012-2013.</p>
3. Continue the coordination with governmental agencies to revise the interagency agreement in order to actualize transitions needs for the students	<p>The SAEE has assigned resources aimed at strengthening the coordination of interagency services in order to strengthen post-secondary transition services.</p> <p>The <i>Administración para el Adiestramiento de Futuros Empresarios y Trabajadores</i> (Administration for the Training of Future Business Owners and Workers, AAFET by its Spanish</p>

Activity	Discussion
	<p>acronym) is a government office which offers training to young people, ages 14 to 29, who have left the formal education system and/or are unemployed. These trainings prepare these students to develop their skills in different vocational trades so that they can achieve and maintain employment and / or establish their own business. Among the services offered are transportation and guidance on the transition process and post-secondary education.</p> <p>PRDE participates in the Interagency Committee for Employment of Persons with Disabilities with the Puerto Rico Office of the Advocate for Persons with Disabilities (OPPI).</p>
<p>4. Utilize strategies utilized in the educational regions with best performance. Develop a needs study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Orient teachers ✓ Regional monitoring of files of students age 16 and above regarding secondary transition ✓ Provide Technical Assistance at the regional level ✓ Implement a plan to work with new teachers in the special education program ✓ Fairs of Study Opportunities 	<p>The Technical Assistance Unit met with CSEE-level Academic Facilitators who work on transition matters to discuss best practices amongst the regions and the resulting successes for transition services. At that meeting, the Facilitators discussed what strategies they used and the group created a working plan for transition services.</p> <p>Visits were made to both public and private institutions where special education students 16 and older were enrolled to ensure that monitoring was occurring and that the services were being provided in accordance with the legal requirements in the area of transitions services.</p> <p>The SAEE worked with the Program Director of Social Work and Counseling, within the Office for Student and Community Affairs at PRDE to identify support and resources to strengthen support services to special education teachers.</p>
<p>5. Teacher and administrative personnel training</p>	<p>Trainings on transition to adult life, as well as the development of post-secondary goals and annual goals for IEPs, were given to special education teachers who are placed at juvenile institutions and special education teachers from AFEET.</p> <p>Additionally, in December 2011, newly appointed school directors received training from SAEE, which included training related to postsecondary transition.</p> <p>In November 2011, as part of the special education week, APNI offered training to personnel and other interested stakeholders regarding post-secondary outcomes.</p> <p>Trainings were also conducted with Special Education School Facilitators from the Regions of: Arecibo, Caguas, San Juan, Humacao, and Ponce on Indicators 13 and 14.</p> <p>Trainings were held for SAEE central level personnel on procedures for secondary transition and the general supervision system.</p>

Activity	Discussion
6. Strengthen and intensify relations between rehabilitation and vocational programs in order to improve our services.	As mentioned above, the SAEE has assigned resources aimed at strengthening the coordination of interagency services in order to improve post-secondary transition services. Various meetings were held with the <i>Consejo Estatal de Rehabilitación de Puerto Rico</i> (the State Rehabilitation Council of Puerto Rico).
7. Review and evaluate PRDE's data collection method for this indicator.	As discussed above, PRDE used a Spanish translation of the Transition IEP B13 Checklist, created by the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC). During FFY 2010, the certification form discussed in Puerto Rico's FFY 2009 APR was modified slightly. Specifically, one question was added to address a State-level data collection requirement. As discussed above, minor changes were made to the survey in FFY 2011 to clarify confusion teachers and facilitators had regarding transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies (former questions seven and eight). These questions have been revised and included as the new question seven.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future, as necessary, to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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.

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

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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	<p style="text-align: center;"> <u>14A: 48.4%</u> <u>14B: 55.7%</u> <u>14C: 87.5%</u> </p>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 14A:44.8% 14B:51.0% 14C:79.0 %

Source Data:

a. # enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	b. # competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a')	c. # enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a' or 'b')	d. # in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a', 'b', or 'c')	e. TOTAL # of respondent youth no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect the time they left school ("respondents")
974	135	524	84	2,173

Measurement 14A:

a. # enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	e. TOTAL # of respondents	Measurement = (a / e) * 100
974	2,173	44.8%

Measurement 14B:

a. # enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	b. # competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a')	e. TOTAL # of respondents	Measurement = [(a + b) / e] * 100
974	135	2,173	51.0%

Measurement 14C:

a. # enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	b. # competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a')	c. # enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a' or 'b')	d. # in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not included in 'a', 'b', or 'c')	e. TOTAL # of respondents	Measurement = [(a + b + c + d) / e] * 100
974	135	524	84	2,173	79.0 %

PRDE uses census data for this indicator, using its 618 data table on exiting to obtain the number of students who would be considered no longer in secondary schools and who had IEPs in

effect at the time they left school. As discussed in its SPP, PRDE's data collection survey was designed using the National Post School Data Outcomes Center (Oregon University): Post School Data Collection Protocol. SERRC, DAC, and the NPSO Advisory Board provided technical assistance in finalizing the survey as well as establishing procedures for its implementation and use.

In April 2012, meetings were held with the Transition Facilitators to prepare and establish strategies for gathering Indicator 14 data. During the meetings the survey was discussed, and questions raised regarding the survey were addressed. Each Transition Facilitator, a position assigned at the regional level, was given instructions for completing the survey along with a list of students from her region who exited in FFY 2010. The lists provided to the Transition Facilitators listed students by region, district and school in order to help facilitate locating the students. The Transition Facilitators were responsible for training the applicable personnel, including the School Facilitators, on the purpose and use of the survey. In order to maximize student responses to the survey, the School Facilitators collaborated with School Counselors, Social Workers and Teachers. Located students were contacted by telephone. Visits were conducted in lieu of phone calls as necessary. Completed surveys were sent to the PRDE SAEF central-level office for review and data analysis.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

Activity	Discussion
1. Review the transitional services guide	The SAEF reviewed the Transition Manual. The draft of the manual is now being reviewed by the Parents Committee.
2. Evaluate and define strategies to ensure high response rate, specifically for the hard- to- find populations. Implement accordingly.	The strategies to identify the students started at the end of the school semester. Efforts were made to identify earlier the student population to update their personal data and facilitate data collection. These efforts were carried out with the CSEE Academic Facilitators in charge of transition (i.e., the Transition Facilitators) and with the School Facilitators.
3. Increase and maintain professional development on selected topics in secondary transition including professional development seminars for high school teachers, guidance counselors, and administrators to support students to pursue higher education.	<p>The SAEF Technical Assistance Unit designed uniform procedures to train all of the educational regions in the transition process.</p> <p>SAEF central-level staff met with Academic Facilitators working in the transition area to train them in processes related to Indicator 14. These Facilitators in turn trained other staff on how to conduct interviews and locate students one year after the students exit the school system.</p> <p>The SAEF worked in collaboration with the Program Director of Social Work and Counseling, within the Office for Student and Community Affairs at PRDE, to locate students one year after graduation. One reason for this collaboration was to include social workers in the process.</p>
4. Promote and encourage timely student response to the post-school interviews, including distribution of flyers to inform parents and youth of	PRDE held orientation sessions during Special Education Month wherein PRDE promoted the importance of student participation and timely response to the post-school surveys.

Activity	Discussion
the post-school interviews and other media options.	
5. Update or develop plans to improve post-secondary transition education and services and capacity implement	<p>Trainings were provided to Regional, District and CSEE Facilitators and Special Education Academic Facilitators regarding indicators 13 and 14, the FFY 2009 APR results, required evidence for demonstrating compliance with the requirements for post-secondary transition, the monitoring process, and entering data into SEASWEB.</p> <p>Trainings were given on transition to adult life, as well as the development of post-secondary goals and annual goals for IEPs. Trainings were held for directors from the social work and counseling programs, special education teachers who are placed at juvenile institutions, APNI personnel, and teachers of special education from AFEET. A training discussing transition was held for new school directors in December 2011. Additionally,</p> <p>Trainings were also conducted with Special Education School Facilitators from the Regions of: Arecibo, Caguas, San Juan, Humacao, and Ponce on Indicators 13 and 14.</p> <p>Trainings were held for personnel in the SAEE on procedures for secondary transition and the general supervision system</p>
6. Identify additional technical assistance for students' outcomes improvement and activities for student retention.	<p>Refer to discussions in Indicators 1, 2, and 13. For example, as discussed under Ind. 1, the PRDE <i>Training and School Counseling Program</i> sponsors various projects to strengthen student retention.</p> <p>As part of its 2011 OSEP verification visit results activity, PRDE has chosen to focus its efforts on increasing retention and reducing dropout rates in the Ponce region, specifically in the Ponce District. PRDE is working in collaboration with the United States Department of Education and its technical assistance providers to develop strategies to reduce dropout rates. This project in the Ponce District is intended to function as a pilot program, and successes in student retention may become applicable island-wide.</p>
7. Coordination meetings with the Auxiliary Secretary for students and Community Services to improve of the collection and validation of the data.	See discussions through this indicator, including Activity #3 above.

Activity	Discussion
<p>8. Enforce and supervise the use of the exit survey collection data with the latest student personal information and future possible references to contact them electronically.</p>	<p>School Facilitators coordinated and supported special education program requirements at the school level resulting in more accessible service to students and parents.</p> <p>The School Facilitators are responsible to ensure student information is constantly updated and accurate in the SEAS Web system. The performance of this function by the School Facilitators has improved PRDE's ability to maintain valid contact information for communicating with students and their parents.</p>
<p>9. Identify more settings for students placement alternatives in postsecondary higher education based on interagency collaboration agreements or thought creations of partnerships</p>	<p>Indicator 14 is the area of focus for PRDE. Numerous internal meetings have been held to discuss post-secondary transitions including stakeholders meetings and parents. Further, PRDE selected this indicator for its results activity connected to its 2011 verification visit from OSEP.</p> <p>Also, see discussion under Indicator 13.</p>
<p>10. Develop two major activities to encourage the student's outcomes improvement and their school retention</p>	<p>As discussed above under activity #9, PRDE selected post-secondary outcomes as the area of focus for its results activity. OSEP conducted a verification visit in Puerto Rico in October 2011. During FFY 201, After the results activity, PRDE created its Part B Indicator 14 Results Improvement Plan (see Attachment B). PRDE has continued its efforts with the results improvement plan and has made numerous efforts regarding its activities. For example coordination with the Program Directors of Social Work and Counseling programs, and orientation to the Facilitators of each personnel were given (para presentarles la importancia de su colaboracion en este indicador) developed through this process.</p> <p>Additionally, PRDE provided orientations on special education issues to the community during Special Education Month.</p>
<p>11. Review our Post-Secondary Outcomes data to identify trends and changes over time. As part of the annual review, we will revise the Improvement Activities as needed.</p>	<p>PRDE will continue to review post-secondary outcomes data through the survey used to collect this data, as well as data collected with the results activity. The results activity, focusing on reducing the dropout rate in the Ponce District, may help identify island-wide trends.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

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.

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

<p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>a. # of findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>States are required to use the “Indicator 15 Worksheet” to report data for this indicator (see below).</p>

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 (2011-2012)</i>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 100%

The data for this measurement appear in Puerto Rico’s completed Worksheet B-15, which is included below.

Actual Measurement:

A. # of findings of noncompliance (priority areas)	B. # of corrections within one year	%
81	81	100%

For purposes of Puerto Rico’s Worksheet B-15, the number of ‘LEAs’ reflects the number of PRDE entities (i.e., school districts or service centers) that were issued findings. For clarification, PRDE remains a unitary system and as such consists of only one LEA. The treatment of districts and service centers as ‘LEAs’ is done here solely in an effort to organize PRDE’s monitoring and general

supervision activities into meaningful units that can then meet the APR reporting requirements; it does not affect PRDE's status as a unitary system.

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	3
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	10	10	10
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	10	10	10
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	35	35
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	9	9	9
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	2	2

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with 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 service needs.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	10	10	10
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other Areas of Noncompliance	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			81	81
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (Column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY 2011:

During FFY 2011, PRDE met the 100% target, successfully ensuring the correction of noncompliance within one year of identification for all 81 findings identified during FFY 2010. The 81 findings were identified in written reports resulting from (i) onsite monitoring visits made by the PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) and (ii) and State Complaint investigations. This FFY 2011 APR data marks an improvement of 11.5% from Puerto Rico's FFY 2010 APR data for this indicator (88.5%).

PRDE's efforts in order to guarantee confirmation of correction have been consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. PRDE verified the correction of individual cases of previously identified noncompliance. PRDE also reviewed additional updated data in the previously identified noncompliance area in order to assure correction of any underlying issues leading to noncompliance and subsequent compliant practice (i.e., to ensure that the specific regulatory requirements at issue are being correctly implemented.). For example, at one entity with identified noncompliance in early childhood transition, PRDE staff conducted an on-site visit subsequent to the findings of noncompliance and reviewed updated records to determine that current practice (in the area) was compliant. All records reviewed demonstrated the district has compliant practices.

Throughout 2011-2012, PRDE continued to work closely with the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC), for technical assistance related to improving systems for data collection, reporting and general supervision in order to ensure the correction of noncompliance no later than one year after its identification. With their assistance, key PRDE accomplishments were achieved during 2011-2012. This included revisions to update the Monitoring Manual regarding the use of the Self- Assessment and the identification of non-compliance via review of data in PRDE SAEE's information system. Additionally, SERRC worked with the SAEE Technical Assistance Unit (TA Unit) and the MCU to review and enhance the ways in which the TA Unit can use MCU data to help inform its decisions regarding the provision of technical assistance. More information regarding PRDE accomplishments, including PRDE's work with SERRC and DAC, is discussed below under the subheading *Discussion of 2011-2012 Improvement Activities*.

Update on the Correction of Non-Compliance Identified in Prior Years

Herein, PRDE provides updates on the correction of non-compliance identified by the MCU in FFY 2009 (the correction of which was reported in the FFY 2010 APR). As reported in the FFY 2010 APR, a total of 7 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 had not been corrected within one year of identification. These 7 findings were connected to a total of five entities (4 CSEEs and one school district). Since the submission of the FFY 2010 APR, six of these seven FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance have been verified as corrected, and accordingly, closed. For the one case that has not yet been verified as corrected and closed, PRDE has applied its sanctions policy and is continuing to work with the entity to ensure correction. Please refer to PRDE's FFY 2011 APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with Puerto Rico's FFY 2011 APR for a more detailed and updated discussion on the correction of noncompliance connected to Indicator 15.

As instructed by OSEP, detailed information regarding the correction of previously identified noncompliance from prior years is provided under the specific indicator to which the noncompliance relates. For example, correction of noncompliance related to early childhood transition is described under Indicator 12 rather than under Indicator 15. Additionally, as required by the FFY 2011 special conditions to Puerto Rico's IDEA grant award, data regarding the correction of noncompliance for the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 for the items previously addressed in the 2007 Agreement are addressed in Puerto Rico's APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with the FFY 2011 APR.

Discussion of 2011-2012 Improvement Activities

PRDE has benefited from technical assistance provided by SERRC and DAC throughout 2011-2012. A series of meetings were held between PRDE, SERRC, and DAC on a variety of topics related to PRDE SAE's general supervision system and correction of noncompliance within one year of identification. These meetings are held at PRDE. The main participants from PRDE are PRDE SAE's Monitoring Unit staff and Special Assistants to the PRDE Sub-Secretary for Special Education. SERRC and DAC have also facilitated the coordinated communications between the PRDE and the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Lead Agency for Part C, in order to improve the smooth transition of children from Part C to Part B. The following chart summarizes the key topics addressed during each of the PRDE/SERRC/DAC meetings:

TA Dates	SERRC – DAC TA supported PRDE through
July 27-29, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlining and reviewing Data Management Manual that includes information for all 618 Tables 1 and APR indicators • Discussing routine data quality reports for review by Service Centers and School Districts in areas relevant to 618 reporting and the APR indicators • Reviewing how to prepare a first run Child Count and Educational Environments reports for review by School Districts • Preparation for participation in the August 4 OSEP sponsored Data Results Workshop • Preparation to generate a School and District Special Education Performance Profile for 2011-12 data
August 4, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in OSEP sponsored Data Results Workshop
August 15-19, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the preliminary child count and educational environments data and compared to previous year's data • Reviewing the organized 616 and 618 data materials for OSEP scheduled verification visit • Preparation of CrEAG documents
September 6-9, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for PRDE Verification Visit • Meeting with the TA Unit to support the general supervision system • Meeting with the Compliance Unit to develop the Plan for completing APR
October 3-7, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in PRDE Verification Visit
January 17-18, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with the Associate Secretary for Special Education to update the January – December 2012 DAC/SERRC Technical Assistance Plan • Review and preparation of APR and 618 submissions due Feb. 1, 2012
March 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a plan for providing technical assistance to PRDE in their response to the OSEP Verification Visit letter • Reviewing PRDE Monitoring procedures/Manual and support drafting of revisions • Conducting analysis of self-assessment and data system for making findings of noncompliance. • Reviewing PRDE plan for implementation of Continuous Improvement Plan, re: Indicator 14 • Completing the update to work plan for 2012 Technical Assistance. • Cooperatively planning with SERRC and DAC for the scheduled June Administrators' workshops

TA Dates	SERRC – DAC TA supported PRDE through
May 8-10, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting the update of the Interagency Agreement between Part C and Part B. • Review/revising/re-affirming the procedures for Part C notifying Part B of referrals from Part C. • Meeting with the Technical Assistance Unit and Monitoring Unit to develop technical assistance plan for districts. • Reviewing clarified APR/SPP documents • Discussing written procedures for using SEASWEB for monitoring for indicators 11 & 12 and the Monitoring Manual • Developing draft agenda for August Administrator’s training

Looking Forward to 2012-2013

During 2012-2013, PRDE SAAE’s work with SERRC will focus in large part on:

- Continue to review the monitoring manual and activities to assist PRDE in evaluating the effectiveness of the procedures, including data system monitoring.
- Provide support with the Results Indicator Initiative
- Increase the skill of the Technical Assistance Unit to build and develop teachers’ capacity to write effective secondary transition plans.
- Continue facilitation of communications and coordination between PRDE and PRDH.
- Assisting in the development of routine communication procedures between legal and special education divisions by conducting training for due process procedures.
- Continue to develop the coordination and collaboration skills among the Monitoring and Compliance Unit, Data Unit, and Technical Assistance Unit
- Continue producing a data progress report that compares state performance on select 618 data and APR data over a three or four year period.
- Expanding the draft data management manual that includes each of the 618 data collections and each of the SPP/APR indicator measurements with sections that address (1) data collection (data source, data entry, business rules, and professional development), (2) electronic validations and edit checks, (3) data source verification, (4) data analysis, (5) use, and (6) reporting.

The following table discusses PRDE’s efforts to carry out the improvement activities identified in its SPP.

Activity	Discussion
1. Review and revise the monitoring system to include aspects identified as per the SPP.	PRDE completed this activity in FFY 2008. Please see the discussion in the FFY 2008 APR.
2. Send close out letters to entities which evidenced correction of 100% of noncompliance findings.	MCU has sent close-out letters to all entities which evidenced correction of 100% noncompliance findings.
3. Send notification letters to entities with repeated non-compliance findings with one year of identification. These letters will identify the level of sanctions and the enforcement activities that will be carried out	All entities entering the sanctions system as a result of failing to correct noncompliance within one year of identification were issued such notification letters.

Activity	Discussion
4. Continue to implement the monitoring cycles to entities providing special education services.	For FFY 2011-2012, PRDE made some revisions to its annual monitoring cycle approach. In addition to conducting on-site monitoring visits, PRDE MCU additional conducted monitoring of district self-assessment. See the FFY 2011 APR Supplemental Report for continued expansions of PRDE's monitoring process.
5. Incorporate compliance component as part of the Statewide Personnel Development System.	See discussion above. Training has been given on the indicators as well as strong advice on the requirements. Work has been done to strengthen the connection between the Monitoring Unit and the Technical Assistance Unit in order to ensure a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities and interconnectedness between the MCU's identified findings and technical assistance. Significant training has also been provided to the district-level academic facilitators.
6. Incorporate the use of the data from the special education information system, as part of the monitoring efforts.	In the past, the MCU used data from its special education information system to select the files to be reviewed during on-site monitoring visits. In FFY 2011, PRDE expanded its use of data from the special education information system within monitoring. PRDE issue findings of noncompliance based on reviews of data in the information system without requiring an on-site visit.
7. Train and provide technical assistance regarding compliance to the educational system.	See discussion above.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

Indicator 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.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 (2011-2012)</i>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 100%

Data from Table 7 (FFY 2011):

- (1) # of written, signed complaints received (total): 86
 - (1.1) # of complaints with reports issued: 75
 - (a) # of reports with findings of noncompliance: 46
 - (b) # of reports within timeline: 69
 - (c) # of reports within extended timelines: 6
 - (1.2) Complaints pending: 0
 - a) # of complaints pending a due process hearing: 0
 - (1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed: 11

FFY 2011 Measurement:

Data Year	1.1(b)	1.1(c)	1.1(b) + 1.1(c) = 1.1
2011-2012	69	6	75

Data Year	1.1	Divided by 1.1	Times 100	= Percent
2011-2012	75	1	100	100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

PRDE met the mandatory 100% target for Indicator 16 for FFY 2011. Despite a significant increase in the number of State complaints filed. PRDE attributes this increase to PRDE’s promotion of the State Complaint process and customer satisfaction with the results of filing a State complaint.

This is the fourth consecutive year in which PRDE has met the 100% target for this indicator, which is a significant accomplishment and the result of consistent dedication to this compliance indicator over the past several years. This steady and impressive trend of progress to reaching and maintaining 100% compliance with the timely resolution of State Complaints is evident through a review of PRDE’s APR submissions and its special condition reports relating to State Complaints over prior years, as demonstrated in the below chart.

PRDE APR Indicator 16 Performance (Actual Measurement Data)							
FFY 2004 (Baseline/SPP)	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011
0%	2.78%	56.04%	92.65%	100%	100%	100%	100%

At the time of the SPP submission, based on FFY 2004 data, PRDE had a virtually non-functional State complaint process. PRDE struggled with not only the timeliness requirements but also with responding to State complaints whatsoever. A substantial backlog of State Complaints accumulated while new complaints continued to be filed into a troubled system.

Due to this situation, a Special Condition was attached to Puerto Rico’s FFY 2006 IDEA grant award related to its State Complaint process. The FFY 2006 Special Condition regarding the State Complaint process established a series of timelines by which the PRDE Office of Special Education was required to reduce the then existing backlog of complaints and efficiently manage new complaints. In establishing timelines, the Special Condition classified all complaints into three categories: (i) backlogged unresolved complaints filed prior to 2/28/06 (Backlogged Complaints), (ii) complaints filed between 2/28/06 and 11/30/06 (“New 2006 Complaints”), and (iii) complaints filed between 12/1/06 and 4/30/07 (“Newest Complaints”). The number of Backlogged Complaints that PRDE was facing at the time was 117.

By the close of FFY 2006, PRDE successfully reported upon and thus eliminated the entire category of Backlogged Complaints, closed all of the New 2006 Complaints and met the timeliness requirements for that category as established in the Special Conditions, and successfully closed 66.7% of the Newest Complaints category. At that time, the main obstacle to PRDE meeting full compliance with the timeliness requirements was that its resources were still consumed in large part in eliminating the Backlogged Complaints and the newest 2006 Complaints. PRDE reported on its efforts in meeting the FFY 2006 Special Conditions in its Special Conditions Report dated February 1, 2007 and its Final Special Conditions Report dated May 30, 2007.

While recognizing PRDE’s hard work and demonstration of solid progress, OSEP again attached a Special Condition to Puerto Rico’s FFY 2007 IDEA grant award related to the State Complaint process. Similar to the FFY 2006 Special Condition, the FFY 2007 Special Condition established a series of timelines by which PRDE was required to reduce the then existing backlog of complaints and come into full compliance with the timeliness requirements. The FFY 2007 Special Condition classified complaints into the following three categories: (i) complaints filed before May 1, 2007, (ii) complaints filed between May 1, 2007 and November 30, 2007, and (iii) complaints filed between December 1, 2007 and April 30, 2008. PRDE successfully complied with its Special Conditions eliminating all backlogged complaints, demonstrating increased compliance with the timeliness requirements over the progression of complaint groupings, and reported that 96.3% of complaints in the final category had timely decisions issued. PRDE reported on its efforts in meeting

the FFY 2007 Special Conditions in its Special Conditions Report dated February 1, 2008, its Final Special Conditions Report dated May 30, 2008, and its Final Special Conditions Report Update filed June 30, 2008. PRDE's substantial compliance with the timeliness requirements was sufficient to have the special conditions lifted. As a result of PRDE's hard work and demonstrated improvement, no Special Condition related to State Complaints was attached to Puerto Rico's FFY 2008 IDEA grant.

In Puerto Rico's FFY 2008 IDEA Part B grant award, OSEP notified PRDE that Puerto Rico's FFY 2008 IDEA Part B grant award would not include any special conditions regarding State Complaints due to Puerto Rico's demonstrated progress and substantial compliance with the timeliness requirements for State complaint resolution. Specifically, OSEP noted:

...on the issue of State complaints, Puerto Rico submitted a revised progress report on June 30, 2008, indicating that there is no longer a backlog of overdue State complaints and that for the 20 State complaints filed between December 1, 2007 and April 30, 2008 and for which a written decision was due, 95% of the decisions were timely. OSEP looks forward to Puerto Rico's demonstration of continued substantial compliance related to State complaints.

OSEP FFY 2008 IDEA Part B Grant Award Letter to PRDE dated July 3, 2008, p. 2. Recognizing PRDE's sustained compliance, USDE did not issue any special conditions related to this indicator for FFY 2009 or FFY 2010. After the special conditions were removed, PRDE continued to report its compliance with issuing timely reports resolving State Complaints on a quarterly basis under Puerto Rico's 2007 Compliance Agreement with the United States Department of Education.

PRDE's 100% compliance with issuing timely reports resolving State Complaints since FFY 2008 and throughout FFY 2011 has continued into FFY 2012. In fact, PRDE is proud to report that it is in 100% compliance under this indicator for FFY 2012 to date.

In addition to its compliance with timeliness requirements of 34 CFR § 300.152, PRDE has continued to make significant administrative efforts to improve its overall work with State complaints and to ensure the sustainability of its compliance with the timeliness requirements. During FFY 2009, PRDE added a staff member dedicated to State complaint resolution and an Administrative Complaint Investigator (Lead Administrative Complaint Investigator) assigned to oversee and manage the tracking of the State Complaints and to help collect the data for federal reporting. PRDE provided training and technical assistance to the new Administrative Complaint Investigator to help with the transition.

Staffing for the overall handling of the State Complaint process (including intake, investigation, analysis and report issuance) consists of two investigators, an administrative assistant, and an attorney. The two investigators divide the complaints equally and meet on a nearly daily basis to discuss effective strategies and approaches. These regular discussions have been extremely helpful to the resolution process. Each investigator is responsible to investigate, follow-up, draft and file his or her report. The Director of the SELD is the attorney responsible for drafting the final reports, and the secretary assists with the overall management of the complaint process.

Over the past year, the SELD once again closely monitored the State Complaint workload and workflow to determine if additional resources were required. SELD has determined that the current staffing level is sufficient. Nonetheless, SELD has maintained the proactive measure implemented in FFY 2009 of having two additional SELD attorneys trained on the State Complaint process who are charged with assisting in the State Complaint process if and when periods of time arise in which additional resources are needed.

Pending complaints are monitored regularly through the status logs maintained by the complaint investigators. Each Administrative Complaint Investigator manages his or her own complaints in a single log with a system of alerts to indicate the time left to resolve each complaint within the 60-day timeline. The Administrative Complaint Investigators regularly update the log and provide the status information to the relevant parties to ensure complaints are handled in a timely manner. An analysis of the State Complaint files is made monthly to ensure all complaints are registered.

PRDE has continuously worked to ensure that its State Complaint filing process is accessible to all. In addition to being filed at the central level, a State Complaint can be filed in every Educational Region or even submitted by mail. During a quarterly visit related to the 2007 Compliance Agreement in FFY 2010, PRDE shared evidence with OSEP of State Complaints received by mail. The Administrative Complaint Investigators receive help from all the other Investigators assigned to the Regions. These investigators are duly trained in the process of State Complaint Management. In FFY 2010, PRDE ensured that its model State Complaint form is available and easily accessible on the PRDE website along with instructions on how to submit a State Complaint. Through these efforts, PRDE is working to ensure that the State Complaint process is accessible to everyone in Puerto Rico.

PRDE has achieved these accomplishments through much hard work and dedication from its team of people in the SELD. PRDE appreciates the support and assistance it has continually received from OSEP as it has worked to achieve this goal

Activity	Discussion
1. Validation checks of information system to ensure all complaints are being recorded.	Analysis of the State Complaint files and the information system is made to ensure all complaints are registered and that the State Complaints data system is operating efficiently. There have not been any problems with efficient and regular data input.
2. Monitor timeline of all pending complaints and determine if further action need be taken (i.e., communication with investigator or assigned lawyer to determine why any delay in progress, etc.).	PRDE complied with this activity throughout FFY 2011. Each Administrative Complaint Investigator manages his or her own complaints in a single status log with a system of alerts to indicate the time left to resolve each complaint within the 60-day timeline. The Administrative Complaint Investigators regularly update the log and provide the status information to the relevant parties to ensure complaints are handled in a timely manner.
3. Hold trainings for investigators, lawyers, and other personnel related to the state complaint process.	Appropriate personnel have received training related to the State Complaint process.
4. Review and improve as appropriate the state complaint filing process, to include designing and incorporating a new model complaint form and expanding the sites wherein a state complaint can be filed.	PRDE has made significant strides with this activity, particularly since FFY 2007, continuing through FFY 2011. During FFY 2007, PRDE reviewed and improved its State Complaint filing process, including two key accomplishments: (i) designing and incorporating a new model complaint form and (ii) expanding the sites where a State Complaint can be filed. During FFY 2008, PRDE continued with the use of the new model complaint form and the expansion of ways in which a State Complaint can be filed, including filing by mail. During FFY 2009, PRDE ensured the complaint form was available on the PRDE website, along with the postal address for submission of State Complaints by mail.
5. Evaluate resources and seek to hire new personnel to	As discussed above, PRDE has monitored the State Complaint workload and has determined that current staffing levels are

Activity	Discussion
work with the state complaint process as determined appropriate (likely an additional investigator and an additional lawyer).	sufficient. The current staffing arrangement consists of four staff members dedicated to the State Complaint process (two Investigators, a Secretary, and the Director of SELD). An additional two attorneys have been trained and designated to assist this core staff of four in the event additional resources are needed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 2011-2012</i>	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 82.0%

Data from Table 7 (FFY 2011):

Data Year	3.2—Hearings (fully adjudicated)	3.2(a)—Decisions within timeline	3.2(b)—Decisions within appropriately extended timeline
2011-2012	887	589	138

FFY 2011 Measurement:

Data Year	3.2(a) + 3.2(b)	3.2	[3.2(a) + 3.2(b)] / 3.2	Times 100	= Percent
2011-2012	727	887	727/887=.8196	0.x100=81.96	82.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

The percent of fully adjudicated due-process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline properly extended by the hearing officer for FFY 2011 was 82.0%, which reflects an increase from FFY 2010 of 4.3%. PRDE remains committed to ensuring efficient management of due process complaints, including compliance with hearing timelines. Sustained efforts to this regard have resulted in continued improvement with Indicator 17. The following chart demonstrates PRDE’s marked improvement with this indicator as compared over the past six years.

PRDE Performance on Ind. 17, FFY 2006-FFY 2011					
FFY 2006 APR	FFY 2007 APR	FFY 2008 APR	FFY 2009 APR	FFY 2010 APR	FFY 2011 APR
51.5%	50.1%	52.8%	69.2%	77.7%	82.0%

The PRDE Secretarial Unit, the office which oversees due process complaint hearing requests, monitors the hearing officers’ management of due process complaints. While monitoring is continuous and on-going, PRDE issues monthly reports to each hearing officer regarding the management of their caseload. These monthly monitoring reports include a status report on pending cases as well as a statistical report on the hearing officer’s overall caseload management. The data regarding the status of pending cases includes:

- Number of days elapsed from the date each complaint was assigned
- Identification of complaints that have exceeded the adjudication timelines
- Identification of complaints for which the hearing officer has properly extended the adjudication timeline.

The statistical report portion includes the following data:

- Number of complaints assigned
- Number and percentage of complaints that have been fully adjudicated
- Number and percentage of complaints for which the adjudication timeline has been properly extended

In addition to issuing these monthly reports to the hearing officers, individual meetings are held with each hearing officer to discuss caseload management. The status of pending complaints is discussed, as well as the importance of ensuring time extensions are properly granted, as appropriate.

PRDE continues to see an increase in the number of complaints in which timelines are properly extended, which is reflective of PRDE’s efforts in training hearing officers and revising procedures in this area.

Overall Timely Resolution of Due-Process Complaints

Indicator 17 focuses on the timeliness of due-process complaints that move forward to a hearing; however, efforts at resolving due-process complaints in a non-adversarial manner, including the resolution meetings and mediation process, contribute to the overall timely resolution of due-process complaints filed. In considering the entire universe of due-process complaints filed, PRDE resolved 89% of complaints filed during FFY 2011 in a timely manner, as demonstrated in the table below.

Due-Process Complaints Resolved Timely Overall (including without a Hearing)					
FFY 2006 APR	FFY 2007 APR	FFY 2008 APR	FFY 2009 APR	FFY 2010 APR	FFY 2011 APR
53%	70%	73%	79%	82%	89%

Additional Discussion of Improvement Activities

During FFY 2011, to ensure sustained involvement towards compliance, PRDE continued with the improvement activities outlined in the SPP as reflected in the table below. As stated on Indicator 15 with the

Activity	Discussion
1. Include due process procedures as part of the Statewide Personnel Development System to ensure personnel's understanding and implementation of adequate processes.	PRDE, in a continuous and on-going basis, has organized formal and informal orientations and trainings for its teachers, school personnel, through its Facilitators. Also during the first month of each school semester as part of the general orientation for school personnel the due process procedures have been included to assure that there is understanding and implementation of adequate processes.
2. Request administrative judges to make an explanation of the reasons for resolutions being issued after 45 days timeline.	Throughout FFY 2011, PRDE continued to send monthly reports to hearing officers alerting them of upcoming timeline expirations and asking for explanation for those cases. Additionally, PRDE stresses the importance of compliance with the timelines during group and individual meetings with the judges. PRDE also follows-up with judges regarding cases quickly approaching and/or past the 45-day timeline during these meetings. Additional monthly follow-up to the judges includes outreach via email, phone calls, and personal visits/ meetings regarding complaints that are approaching the expiration of the 45 day period.

Activity	Discussion
<p>3. Continue to inform administrative judges on due process requests that are near the 45 day timeline expiration.</p>	<p>This activity continues the same as the FFY 2010. Monthly follow up is offered to the judges, through email, phone calls and personally, about complaints that the terms are to expire in 45 days. On the other hand, individual meetings we conducted with judges, also offered follow up for those complaints that are not awarded or are about to expire the 45 days terms.</p>
<p>4. Continue periodic training, continuing education, for administrative law judges.</p>	<p>The following orientations and trainings for hearing officers were held during FFY 2011:</p> <p>July 7, 12 and 13, 2011 - Discussion of the Report on the Administrative Work of Administrative Judges of Special Education and individual and group compliance with the procedure of administrative hearings during FFY 2010.</p>
<p>5. Encourage and publicize resolution session option to complainants.</p>	<p>As a part of the registration process, parents are provided a copy of and an orientation to review the procedural safeguards and parents' rights. This document is on PRDE's website, and the information is included in SAE's Procedures Manual. SAE's website has a section dedicated to Due Process.</p> <p>PRDE has resolution meeting facilitators ('Conciliadores') in each Region, who are responsible for timely coordinating and holding the resolution meetings. These facilitators are based at the CSEEs and are available to discuss the resolution process with parents and answer any questions they may have. While the facilitators are located at the CSEEs, they travel to schools and districts in order to hold resolution meetings at locations easily accessible to parents.</p> <p>PRDE has developed and provides a brochure on options to complainants, such as resolution meetings, mediation, and due process hearings. As discussed regarding mediations (see Indicator 19), this brochure is being discussed with the RLV plaintiff class</p>
<p>6. Re-train personnel on the due process procedures including the newly incorporated Resolution Meeting processes.</p>	<p>The Resolution Meeting process has been fully integrated into the service structure at PRDE for several years. On-going "refresher" trainings regarding the process continue island-wide.</p>
<p>7. Review and amend contracts to be used with the administrative judges to specifically include compliance with timeline requirements.</p>	<p>The annual contracts with the administrative judges have been revised to include a clause requiring full compliance with the IDEA 45-day timeline, including the appropriate extension of timelines.</p> <p>Looking forward, PRDE is considering including a penalty clause to address an administrative judge's failure to comply with the timeline requirements.</p>

Activity	Discussion
8. Include in the information system a system for issuing alerts identifying due process cases that are approaching the end of their timelines.	PRDE designed enhancements for its information system that will issue such alerts. PRDE is currently awaiting the recommendations of the new experts appointed by the Court in the RLV case before implementing such changes.
9. Conduct a needs study to determine training area needs for administrative judges.	<p>PRDE has met to identify, assess, and meet the needs that special education administrative judges have to successfully carry out their job responsibilities. This analysis led to the development of PRDE's monitoring of and technical assistance for the hearing officers regarding caseload management (discussed above).</p> <p>Additionally, PRDE received additional feedback directly from the hearing officers via a needs assessment questionnaire. As a result of the input received from the hearing officers, PRDE provided training to address the needs identified therein.</p>
10. Train administrative judges on the requirements for proper time extensions for the 45-day timeline, along with other topics, in accordance with the needs study discussed above.	As discussed above, the hearing officers have been trained, as they requested through a previous needs study, in regards to the proper extension of the 45-day timeline and other matters. Additionally, as discussed in relation to other activities above, trainings were also held regarding the requirements of IDEA more broadly and administrative hearing procedural matters, etc.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 2011-2012</i>	51.75%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 55.9%

During FFY 2011, 55.9% (439/785) of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements as reported in Table 7.

FFY 2011 Measurement:

Data year	3.1(a) Settlement Agreements	3.1 Resolutions Sessions Held	3.1(a) Divided by 3.1	= Percent
2011-2012	439	785	439/785 = 0.5592	55.9%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

During 2011-2012, 785 resolution sessions were held, 439 of which resulted in settlement agreements. As a result, 55.9% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through a resolution settlement agreement. PRDE met its FFY 2011 measurable and rigorous target of 52%, although this reflects a decrease from PRDE's FFY 2010 results (61.5%). A copy of Puerto Rico's FFY 2011 Table 7 is included with this APR submission as **Attachment C**.

In FFY 2008, PRDE began conducting informal parental satisfaction surveys to gather participant feedback regarding the dispute resolution process. For FFY 2009, PRDE continued having mediation participants complete satisfaction surveys to obtain such feedback. In FFY 2010,

PRDE made revisions to its survey to improve its usability. Details regarding these revisions are included below in the improvement activities table.

Of the parents surveyed (139) during FFY 2011, 96% of the parents survey received their appointment before the 15 days' timeline. Regarding special education staff involved in the resolution process, 79% of those surveyed indicated the staff involved demonstrated the necessary knowledge and management of the subject matter—both generally and case-specific. Parents during the process felt listened to, 61% felt respected 59%, and 63% felt engaged in the discussion and decision making process.

Of those surveyed 96% reported that they were satisfied, 4% were not satisfied not satisfied with the resolution meeting process.

Activities	Discussion
<p>1. Visits to the CSEEs to monitor the implementation of the resolution meetings and supervise the investigators' work.</p>	<p>The SAEE Monitoring Unit made on-site monitoring visits during FFY 2011 to all CSEEs, including each CSEE's Resolution Meeting Division. No findings of non-compliance were identified during these visits</p> <p>Additionally, central level staff maintains regular contact with the Resolution Meeting Investigators located at the CSEEs—including communications via email, phone calls, and on-site visits.</p>
<p>2. Meetings with the resolution meeting investigators/facilitators to review any challenges they are facing and clarify doubts about the process and their responsibility.</p>	<p>Individual teleconferences and technical assistance activities were carried out throughout the reporting period. During the teleconferences, PRDE provided technical assistance follow-up regarding compliance with timelines, status of cases, and provided consultation regarding the resolution of issues pending in cases in the resolution process.</p>
<p>3. Monitor and ensure timeliness of resolution sessions to include tracking timelines through the designed computer system.</p>	<p>The Secretarial Unit is in charge of overseeing the management of due process complaints, and as such, their data management system maintains resolution session data as well.</p> <p>As mentioned in the discussion of Activity #1 above, the SAEE Monitoring Unit monitored the Resolution Meeting Divisions at each of the CSEEs during FFY 2010. The CMU utilizes information from the Secretarial Unit's data management system in preparing for and carrying out their monitoring of the CSEE Resolution Meeting Divisions.</p>
<p>4. Continue to design and provide trainings to the investigators/facilitators to further train them in dispute resolution and conflict management.</p>	<p>PRDE continued this activity, meetings were held with mediators and conciliators. Additionally, the MCU provided technical assistance during monitoring visits as needed.</p>
<p>5. Continue to design and provide training to all other relevant personnel (including process, forms, best practices, etc.).</p>	<p>See progress reported for activity # 4 above.</p>

Activities	Discussion
6. Recruit and hire new investigators as the positions open.	PRDE is able to manage the resolution process with the existing personnel and staffing levels.
7. Offer training to all special education teachers around the Island.	Such training is on-going. This FFY 2011 the Legal Division Unit personnel concentrated their efforts on providing training to new personnel, School Directors and Special Education Facilitators.
8. Implement parental evaluation regarding the resolution session experience.	During FFY 2011, PRDE continued using the revised parental evaluation / satisfaction survey.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 2011-2012</i>	65.25%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 75.8%

Data from Table 7 (FFY 2011) Used for Measurement

Data Year	2.1(a)(i) – Agreements Reached in Mediations Related to Due Process	2.1(b)(i) – Agreements Reached in Other Mediations (not Related to Due Process)	2.1 – Total Number of Mediations
2011-2012	302	42	454

Measurement

Data Year	2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)	Divided by 2.1	Multiplied by 100	Percentage/Measurement
2011-2012	344	344/454 = 0.7577	75.77	<u>75.8%</u>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011:

During FFY 2011, 344 of the 454 mediations held (75.8%) resulted in mediation agreements. Three hundred two of the mediations resulting in agreements were related to due process hearings; the remaining 42 mediations resulting in agreements were not related to due process complaints. Puerto Rico exceeded its FFY 2011 target (65.25%) but decreased its rate of mediations resulting in mediation agreements as compared to FFY 2010 (93.2%).

PRDE has in place procedures to resolve controversies regarding special education services through mediation. PRDE's mediation procedures allow parents and the agency to resolve a controversy with the intervention of an impartial mediator, on a voluntary basis. In Puerto Rico, mediation can be requested as part of a due process complaint hearing request or by itself, outside of the filing of a due process complaint. Both alternatives require the identification of a mediator and scheduling mediation meetings in a timely manner.

When mediation is requested as part of a due process request, the process is overseen by the Secretarial Unit. The mediation option is included on the model due process complaint form. When a party enters the mediation process in this manner, the Secretarial Unit receives the mediation request and enters the data into a database to keep track of the process. Once the mediation meetings have occurred, the mediator informs the Secretarial Unit of the results of the meetings, and the Administrative Law Judge (Hearing Officer) is informed in order to continue with the due process procedures accordingly. Mediation procedures under this alternative must take place within the due process timelines. If an agreement is not reached during the mediation, the hearing shall proceed, and a decision reached within the 45-day term.

When mediation is requested outside of a due process complaint, the Secretarial Unit is also in charge of the process of receiving, entering the data, and tracking the progress of the mediation. These mediations do not face the time constraints of those entered within the realm of a due process complaint.

Information regarding the mediation option is also available on the PRDE website as well as in the PRDE SAAE Procedures Manual.

The following chart provides information on the accomplishments, progress, and slippages of the activities proposed in the SPP for the implementation of this indicator.

Activity	Discussion
1. Include mediation as part of the statewide Personnel Development System to ensure adequate comprehension and implementation of mediation process.	PRDE, in a continuous and on-going basis, has arranged formal and informal orientations and trainings for its teachers and school personnel through its general supervisors and district supervisors. Mediation is included in the trainings.
2. Disseminate mediation process to schools and public.	As reported in the FFY 2008 APR, final approval of the SAAE Procedures Manual required review by and discussion with the Rosa Lydia Velez plaintiffs' class. Many meetings and administrative hearings were held to reach an agreement, and in December 2009, the class and PRDE finally approved the new manual and applications. SAAE has used its Procedures Manual to help guide its activities and help to ensure that it implements its mediation process in a uniform manner across the island.

Activity	Discussion
	<p>When a parent registers a child for special education, in the school or in the CSEE, an orientation is provided which includes an overview of the mediation process. Additionally, PRDE distributes a brochure regarding the mediation process across the schools, CSEEs, and districts; and, the PRDE Parent Assistance Unit conducts activities promoting the mediation option.</p> <p>PRDE has continued dissemination efforts through informational meetings at the CSEEs in collaboration with the CSEE, Parents Unit, and district social workers, and APNI (PR PTA).</p>
3. Include mediation as part of the focused monitoring system.	The PRDE Secretarial Unit for Provisional Remedy handles monitoring/oversight of the mediation program and process.
4. Encourage and publicize mediation options.	See progress reported for activity # 2 above.
5. Provide on-going training to mediators.	PRDE continues to provide on-going training for mediators.
6. Collect evaluation feedback from mediators and mediation participants.	PRDE continued to use and collect the evaluation to receive feedback from the mediation participants.
7. Analyze evaluation feedback materials to help identify mediation skills that enhance likelihood of mediation resulting in agreement.	See progress reported for activity # 6 above.
8. Schedule Mediations in a timely manner.	<p>In the past, scheduling mediations in a timely manner was sometimes problematic due to the lack of staff in the office managing mediations and because of the high volume of due process complaints filed. However, since the implementation of the resolution process, the volume of mediations has decreased because parents now have another process to sort out disputes regarding special education services.</p> <p>For FFY 2011, PRDE did not experience any difficulties regarding the timely coordination of mediations.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and

b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see below).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2011 (2011-2012)</i>	<i>100%</i>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011: 100%

PRDE has computed its actual target data for the FFY 2011 APR in accordance with the OSEP tables for Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

SPP/APR Data- Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	4 N/A	4 N/A	20
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	4 N/A	4 N/A	20
4B	4 N/A	4 N/A	20
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	4 N/A	4 N/A	20
10	4 N/A	4 N/A	20
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	328
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2011 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total – (Sum of the subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		433.00

618 Data- Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Date Note Requests	Total
Table 1- Child Count Due Date: 2/1/12	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2- Personnel Due Date: 11/7/12	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3- Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/12	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4- Exiting Due Date: 11/7/12	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5- Discipline Due Date: 11/7/12	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6- State Assessment Due Date: 12/19/12	1	NA	NA	N/A	1
Table 7- Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/7/12	1	1	1	N/A	3
MOE & CEIS Due Date: 5/1/12	1	1	NA	N/A	2
				Subtotal	23
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.8 <u>6957</u>)=		<u>43.00</u>

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	<u>33.00</u>
B. 618 Grand Total	<u>43.00</u>
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	<u>76.00</u>
Total N/A in APR	<u>10</u>
Total N/A in 618	<u>0</u>
Base	<u>876.00</u>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	<u>1.00</u>
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	<u>100.00</u>

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 1.86957 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY 2011:

PRDE achieved ~~-100%~~ on Indicator 20. This ~~maintains a slight decrease from~~ PRDE's FFY 2010 measurement of ~~-100%~~. PRDE remains in ~~substantial~~ compliance with this indicator.

618 Data Collection and Validation Activities

All required reports were submitted by their due dates and revised by the deadline date established by OSEP. The PRDE System collects 618 data necessary for Child Count, Educational Environments, Exiting, Discipline and Personnel submissions. The system is a web-based system that allows school districts to submit, review and revise data according to the established timelines. Data undergo many edit checks that are integrated into the PRDE (SAEE) data submission system to ensure their internal consistency and accuracy. Reasonability checks are also conducted annually before data are finalized to further enhance data accuracy. Data reliability is ensured by maintaining consistent definitions and formats for data collection and providing consistent technical assistance and training. Data validity is ensured by designing the aggregate data collection forms consistent with federal requirements and guidelines and maintaining knowledge of changes at the national level.

APR Data Collection and Verification Activities

As part of its processes for verifying the validity, reliability, and timeliness of reported data, PRDE annually reviews and revises validation rules and reporting categories as needed. Also, PRDE provides technical assistance regarding data collection requirements continuously throughout the school year and as requested by the Districts, Regions and CSEE. The Special Education Monitoring and Compliance Units work with the Data Unit to verify selected data when conducting on-site monitoring visits.

Annually written communications (Memos) are generated to provide data reporting instructions, guidelines and timelines.

PRDE enhanced its data correction processes by providing regularly scheduled and more frequent notices of missing information and reminders for data error corrections to all schools, school districts, and service centers that submit data to PRDE. PRDE consults on a regular basis with national and regional technical assistance providers, including the Data Accountability Center (DAC), Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC), among others, on data collection and reporting. Technical assistance received informs PRDE practice, as well as supporting PRDE TA provided to school districts.

The State continued its participation in the annual data managers meeting during the IDEA Leadership Conference. The IDEA Part B Data Manager participated with the data managers' listserv to keep current on practices with other states and ask questions to clarify the data system implications of new practices or policies, posing questions to other Data Managers as needed between meetings.

The APR Coordinator participates on the OSEP scheduled monthly calls, as well as others related to APR requirements. The APR Coordinator also maintains close contact with the OSEP State Contact to ask questions and clarify APR processes. The Coordinator has developed a calendar for gathering data for each of the indicators from personnel in PRDE, for reviewing each of the indicators, soliciting feedback from SERRC, and making necessary revisions.

The following chart provides information on the accomplishments, progress, and slippages of the activities proposed in the SPP for the implementation of this indicator.

Activities	Discussion
1. Continue to train special education personnel and other related staff in the data based information system.	As noted above PRDE provides TA to school, school district, and service center personnel. Also it is provided as requested by any other personnel. This activity is on-going.
2. Continue implementation of our data base information system island wide.	PRDE continues to implement an island wide data base of special education data that is linked to the SAEE (all student) data system.
3. Incorporate new elements to the data system to improve in our data collection and reporting.	PRDE will continue to incorporate new, enhance, or revised elements into the special education data collections as needed to collect compliant, complete, and comprehensive data that are valid and reliable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011:

PRDE is not proposing any revisions to its proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources at this time. However, PRDE reserves the right to adjust its baseline and targets in the future as necessary to ensure meaningful performance reports.