

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.
1,650	45	1,161	57	0

Measurement:

Data Year	(a - b - d - e)	C Divided by (a-b-d-e)	Times 100	= Percent
2010-2011	1,650-45-57-0 = 1,548	1,161 /1,548 = 0.75	0.75X100 = 75.0	75.0%

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 387 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 since 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 387 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	Unable to determine with data provided
387	256	59	32	40	0

Based on FFY 2010 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 - 343 days. The majority of the children were receiving services within 60 days. 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 supervisors failed to attend transition meetings.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

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.

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

**Progress with Indicator 12 over time**

80.00%  
70.00%  
60.00%  
50.00%  
40.00%  
30.00%  
20.00%  
10.00%  
0.00%

FFY 2006 FFY 2007 FFY 2008 FFY 2009 FFY 2010

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 begun steps that will further ensure compliance.

During 2010-2011, PRDE continued efforts to improve 50.50% 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.

PRDE maintained the placement of a Special Education Supervisor at each one of the island’s Special Education Service Centers who is assigned the responsibility of ensuring an agile process for transitioning children. These supervisors, 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 SEASWEB as having received an initial evaluation. Taskforce activities have included both technical assistance and training to SEASWEB 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 SEASWEB. The hands-on assistance included thorough review of all backlog files—including visits to district offices and schools to locate the impacted students and ensure students had received their initial evaluations. For students who had received their initial evaluations, the supporting documentation was added to the CSEE file and updated accordingly in SEASWEB. For students who had not yet received an initial evaluation, evaluation appointments were made immediately upon locating the students.

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 2010 have received their eligibility determination, and where appropriate, have begun receiving services.

*Correction of Noncompliance Reflected in the FFY 2009 APR*

Puerto Rico has assured the correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2009 APR under Indicator 12, early childhood transition. As of the FFY 2009 APR, PRDE reported that it was unable to evidence a total of 587 students referred from Part C to Part B received their eligibility determinations and provision of services, where appropriate, by the student’s third birthday. Of those 587 students, PRDE was able to confirm that all but 12 had been evaluated and, where appropriate, were receiving services, as of the FFY 2009 APR submission. Since that time, PRDE has 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.

	Students referred from Part C to Part B during FFY 2009 for whom PRDE had not been able to confirm eligibility determinations and provision of services, where appropriate, by the student’s third birthday as of the FFY 2009 APR submission	Outstanding FFY 2009 cases PRDE has confirmed completion of eligibility determinations and provision of services where appropriate	Percent of FFY 2009 re-evaluations pending as of the FFY 2009 APR submission that have been verified as complete
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	12	12	100%

In assuring verification of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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.

Updated Data

The OSEP Puerto Rico Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table (at p. 8) requires PRDE to report on updated data for the period from July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 with the FFY 2010 APR. Accordingly, PRDE has included this updated data in its APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with this FFY 2010 APR.

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 (SEASWEB) 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>PRDE fully implemented this alert in SEASWEB during the 2010-2011 school year. Also, PRDE regularly monitors its log of Part C to Part B referrals to track students about to turn three years old.</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 2010, 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>As discussed in the FFY 2009 APR, PRDE revised and improved its referral process for children referred from Part C to Part B and first implemented the changes in the Ponce, Caguas and Bayamón Regions. In September 2010, the revisions to the referral process were expanded to all regions.</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 SAE (central level). PRDE SAE 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 2010-2011, PRDE continued work with a contractor, Pro Info, 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>SEASWEB trainings were provided to address specific areas of concern. 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 update the information in SEASWEB. Through this collaborative effort, the APNI coordinators at each CSEEs assist with locating the impacted students and ensuring initial evaluations are scheduled, take place, and that SEASWEB is updated accordingly. Collaboration between PRDE and APNI is continuous and ongoing.</p> <p>Also, the School Facilitators assist with the identification of issues at the school level.</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 SAEE Monitoring Unit shares its monitoring reports with the SAEE Technical Assistance Unit, allowing the Technical Assistance Unit to use the monitoring information to improve delivery and content of technical assistance services and ensure that the TA Unit addressing the issues identified through the monitoring process.</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 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 2010

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 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 95.8%**

The following chart summarizes the data for calculating Puerto Rico’s actual measurement for FFY 2010. Of the 15,926 files reviewed, 15,260 met the secondary transition requirements in accordance with Indicator B-13. As such, PRDE’s actual target data for FFY 2010 is in compliance with 95.8%. 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)
15,926	15,260	95.8%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2010:**

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 2009 SPP. One question was added for data collection requirements at the State level. A copy of the certification form used for FFY 2010 is included at Attachment A. 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 SEASWEB for the entire reporting year. The corresponding lists were sent to each CSEE for validation, and data update as necessary. The final update lists then served as the master list for reviewing files.
- > The file of each student on the list was reviewed. CSEE Directors worked with their staffs, including transition coordinators, to complete the checklist for each student file. All staff members 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.
- > SAAE 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 15,926 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:

<b>Transition IEP Checklist Results For 2010-2011</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
1. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age- appropriate transition assessments?	15,576	350	N/A
2. Are there measurable postsecondary goals that address education or training, employment, and (as needed) independent living?	15,652	274	N/A
3. Is/are there annual IEP goals that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals?	15,712	214	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?	15,658	268	N/A
5. Do the transition services include a course of study with focus on	15,639	287	N/A

<b>Transition IEP Checklist Results For 2010-2011</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
Improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate movement from school to post-school?			
6. Do transition services include student participant in academic courses, vocational or technical, which contribute to achieving postsecondary goals?	15,496	430	N/A
7. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent or adult student consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency (ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?	9,740	2,094	4,092
8. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent or adult student consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency (ies) participated in the IEP meeting?	6,819	4,189	4,918
9. 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?	15,024	902	N/A
<b>Does the IEP contain the established legal requisites to comply with Indicator B-13? (In accordance with checklist instructions)</b>	<b>15,260</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>N/A</b>

PRDE has seen significant improvement, and in surpassing the 95% mark has achieved substantial compliance with this indicator. This was an increase of 6.9% as compared to the prior year (FFY 2009). PRDE's continued progress and breaking the 95% mark reflects years of sustained hard work and dedication to ensuring all students receive services according to legal requirements. The chart below reflects PRDE's progress with this indicator since setting the baseline last year.

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

Correction of Noncompliance Reflected in the FFY 2009 APR

OSEP's FFY 2009 APR Response Table for Puerto Rico requires PRDE to report the status of correction of non-compliance reflected in the FFY 2009 Indicator 13 data. With the FFY 2009 APR Submission, in the SPP, PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009. Specifically, PRDE reported that 10,567 of the 11,888 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 2009.

Number of student files reviewed for the FFY 2009 APR for which PRDE was not able to confirm as compliant with Indicator 13 (11,888-10,567)	b. Adjusted item 'a'*	Number of those files (item b) for which PRDE has verified as corrected	Number of those files for which PRDE was not able to verify as corrected	e. % Verified as Corrected
1,321	1,017*	<b>1,017</b>	<b>0</b>	100%

\*In PRDE's FFY 2009 APR, PRDE reported a total of 1,321 student files reviewed for which PRDE was not able to confirm as compliant with Indicator 13. Since that time, PRDE has identified that 304 of those 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 for 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.

In assuring verification of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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	Description
1. Review the Transition Manual, make revisions as necessary.	The SAEE reviewed the Transition Manual. The draft of the manual is now being reviewed by the Parents Committee.
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 2009 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.</p>

Activity	Description
<p>3. Continue the coordination with governmental agencies to revise the interagency agreement in order to actualize transitions needs for the students</p>	<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>Administration para el Adiestramiento de Futuros Empresarios y Trabajadores</i> (Administration for the Training of Future Business Owners and Workers, AAFET by its Spanish 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 transport 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. s Orient teachers S Regional monitoring of files of students age 16 and above regarding secondary transition •S Provide Technical Assistance at the regional level S Implement a plan to work with new teachers in the special education program S Fairs of Study Opportunities</p>	<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>PRDE developed an instrument that would reflect the needs of students 16 or older with significant cognitive impairment to ensure that students receive transition services according to their specific needs.</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>

Activity	Description
5. Teacher and administrative personnel training	<p>Trainings were given to special education teachers who are placed at juvenile institutions. These trainings discussed transition to adult life, as well as the development of post-secondary goals and annual goals for IEPs.</p> <p>Trainings were also conducted with School Superintendents and Special Education School Facilitators on indicators 13 and 14, the FFY 2009 APR results, required evidence for demonstrating compliance, the monitoring process, and entering data into SEASWEB.</p> <p>Separate meetings were held in the Bayamon, Arecibo and San Juan regions for regional School Directors, support personnel and special education teachers to review and analyze FFY 2009 APR data, acquisition of transition certificates, and creating measurable goals. Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14 were discussed.</p> <p>Trainings were held for personnel in the SAEE Legal Division on the procedures for secondary transition, legal requirements, and compliance with the indicator, the results of the FFY 2009 APR, and measurable goals.</p>
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.
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. Additionally, the checklist was modified to collect additional information in the area of the student demographics.

**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 2010

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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	14A: 48.0% 14B: 55.3% 14C: 87.1%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 14A: 59.4%

<u>14B</u>	<u>65.4</u>
<u>14C</u>	<u>83.9</u>

**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")
961	96	230	70	1,617

**Measurement 14A:**

a. # enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	e. TOTAL #of respondents	Measurement = (a / e) *100
961	1,617	59.4%

**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
961	96	1,617	65.4%

**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
961	96	230	70	1,617	83.9%

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 establishing

procedures for its implementation and use.

In March 2011, 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 2009. 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 SAEЕ central-level office for review and data analysis.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

Activity	Discussion
1. Review the transitional services guide	The SAEЕ 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.	In March 2011, PRDE began identifying strategies to identify the student population and facilitate data collection. These efforts were carried out with the participant of the CSEE Academic Facilitators in charge of transition (i.e., the Transition 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 SAEЕ Technical Assistance Unit designed uniform procedures to train all of the educational regions in the transition process.</p> <p>SAEЕ 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 SAEЕ 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.</p> <p>Additionally, training was provided to the Special Education Legal Division staff on the secondary transition requirements, the law, compliance with the indicator, data reported in the FFY 2009 APR, and measurable goals.</p>

Activity	Discussion
4. Promote and encourage timely student response to the post-school interviews, including distribution of flyers to inform parents and youth of the post-school interviews and other media options.	PRDE held orientation sessions during Special Education Month wherein PRDE promoted the importance of student participant and timely response to the post-school surveys.
Update or develop plans to improve post-secondary transition education and services and capacity implement	Trainings were provided to School Superintendents 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.
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.
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>PRDE recruited 1,294 School Facilitators to coordinate and support special education program requirements at the school level resulting in more accessible Service to students and parents. Training was provided to all recruited School Facilitators in the following areas: child find, registration, evaluation, eligibility determination, evaluations, IEP, placement, transport services, related services, assistive technology, IDEA program requirements, and use of information systems.</p> <p>A primary function of the School Facilitators is 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>

Activity	Discussion
9. Identify more settings for students placement alternatives in postsecondary higher education based on interagency collaboration agreements or thought creations of partnerships	Indicator 14 has been an area of focus for PRDE. Numerous internal meetings have been held to discuss post-secondary transitions; further, PRDE selected this indicator for its results activity connected to its 2011 verification visit from OSEP.  Also, see discussion under Indicator 13.
10. Develop two major activities to encourage the student's outcomes improvement and their school retention	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 2010, PRDE worked closely with OSEP staff and technical assistance providers to prepare for the results activity portion of the verification visit. During the visit, parents, community leaders, and students were invited to participate in a discussion of Indicator 14 and brainstorm possible strategies for increasing success in this area. After the results activity, PRDE created its Part B Indicator 14 Results Improvement Plan (see Attachment B). PRDE will continue its efforts with the results improvement plan developed through this process.  Additionally, PRDE provided orientations on special education issues to the community during Special Education Month.
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.	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.

**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 2010

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))

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see [below](#)).

FFY	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 88.5%

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	%
61	54	88.52%

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 Supervisión System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(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	0	0	0
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. Participant 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	0	0	0
	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 Supervisión System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(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	1	1	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	33	33	33
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	0	0	0
	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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	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	9	9	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	9	9	9

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervisión System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)	(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	7	7	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	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
Other areas of noncompliance: Resolution Process	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
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			61	54
<b>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (Column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.</b>			<b>(b) / (a) X100</b>	<b>88.52%</b>

**Discussion of improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress from FFY 2010:**

During FFY 2010, PRDE successfully ensured the correction of noncompliance within one year of identification for 88.52% of the findings identified during FFY 2009. Specifically, PRDE verified correction of 54 of the 61 findings of noncompliance that were identified during FFY 2009. The 61 findings were identified in written reports resulting from (i) onsite monitoring visits made by the PRDE SAEI Monitoring and Compliance Unit and (ii) State Complaint investigations. This FFY 2010 APR data marks an improvement for Puerto Rico's FFY 2009 APR data for

this indicator (85.6%).

PRDE's work to guarantee confirmation of correction has 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 area of previously identified noncompliance in order to assure correction of any underlying issues leading to noncompliance and subsequent compliant practice (i.e., to ensure the specific regulatory requirements at issue are being correctly implemented.). For example, at one entity with noncompliance identified in the area of initial evaluation, in an on-site visit subsequent to the findings of noncompliance, PRDE staff reviewed updated records to determine current practice (in the area) was compliant. All records reviewed demonstrated the district has compliant practices.

Throughout 2010-2011, 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 to ensure the correction of noncompliance no later than one year after its identification. With their assistance, key PRDE accomplishments during 2010-2011 included revisions to update the Monitoring Manual, regarding the use of the Self- Assessment and the newly implemented monitoring process for the CSEEs. More information regarding PRDE accomplishments, including PRDE's work with SERRC and DAC, is discussed below under the subheading *Discussion of 2010-2011 Improvement Activities*.

#### *On-Site Monitoring Process*

Since 2007-2008, PRDE SAAE has worked closely with SERRC and DAC to critically review and revise its monitoring system. Details of PRDE SAAE's work each year has been detailed in past APRs. During FFY 2009, the MCU held initial on-site monitoring visits at the school district and CSEE levels. A significant accomplishment during FFY 2009 was the expansion of the MCU's on-site monitoring visits to include the CSEEs in addition to PRDE school districts. As a result, PRDE Indicator 15 data for FFY 2010 has expanded to include the results MCU's on-site monitoring to the CSEEs.

The seven FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance that PRDE was not able to confirm correction within one year of identification were the result of on-site visits by the PRDE SAAE Monitoring and Compliance Unit. These seven findings were tied to a total of 5 entities (4 CSEEs and one school district). In accordance with PRDE's sanctions policy, each of these entities received initial sanctions letters as a result of their failure to correct noncompliance in a timely manner. More detailed and updated information regarding the implementation of PRDE SAAE's sanctions policy with regard to these entities that failed to correct findings of noncompliance within one year of identification is included in PRDE's FFY 2010 APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with this APR.

#### *Update on the Correction of Non-Compliance identified in Prior Years*

In past APRs, PRDE herein provided updates on previously identified non-compliance from prior years that related to specific APR indicators and Items connected to Puerto Rico's 2007 Compliance Agreement and MOA with ED. As instructed by OSEP's current Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table (at p. 16), detailed information regarding the correction of noncompliance related to a specific indicator is provided under the specific indicator. For example, correction of noncompliance related to early childhood transition is described under Indicator 12 rather than here under Indicator 15.

Similarly, as required by OSEP's Puerto Rico Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, updated data regarding the correction of noncompliance for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 for the items previously addressed in the 2007 Agreement are addressed in Puerto Rico's APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with the FFY 2010 APR. See OSEP Response Table at p. 13 (requiring the submission of this stated updated data with the FFY 2010 APR).

Herein, PRDE provides updates on the correction of non-compliance identified by the MCU in FFY 2008. As reported in the FFY 2009 APR, a total of 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 had not been corrected within one year of identification. These 13 findings were connected to a total of five school districts. Prior to the FFY 2009 APR submission, one of those districts exited the sanctions system, closing out two of the findings. As such, as of the time of the FFY 2009 APR submission, a total of eleven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 remained open. Since the submission of the FFY 2009 APR, all of the remaining eleven FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 have been verified as corrected, and accordingly, closed. Please refer to

PRDE's FFY 2010 APR Supplemental Report, submitted simultaneously with Puerto Rico's FFY 2010 APR for a more detailed and updated discussion on the correction of noncompliance connected to Indicator 15, including a detailed discussion of PRDE's implementation of its sanctions policy as it relates to entities that failed to correct findings of noncompliance within one year of identification.

*Discussion of 2010-2011 Improvement Activities*

PRDE has benefited from technical assistance provided by SERRC and DAC throughout 2010- 2011. 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 in-person, at PRDE, and each monthly meeting typically lasted two full days. 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, 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:

Meeting Dates	Key Topics
September 13-14, 2010	> Teleconference with DAC regarding validation of data and correction of non-compliance.
September 20-21, 2010	> Onsite intensive TA visit: September 20, 2010 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Met with the Acting Associate Secretary for Special Education to continue prioritizing technical assistance on data collection, analysis, reporting, and use.</li> <li>2. Met with the Part B Data Manager to review progress on the development of the written data management routines, trend data charts, and reports needed for submission in November.</li> <li>3. Met with the Monitoring and Compliance Unit for an update on monitoring activities, including the status of data collection through the self-assessment and schedule for receiving these back from districts.</li> </ol> > On-site Supportive TA during ED quarterly MOA and compliance agreement visit, Supported the Puerto Rico Department of Education, Special Education Office.
October 13, 2010	> Teleconference with SERRC to coordinate TA regarding Assistive Technology

Meeting Dates	Key Topics
October 22, 2010	Conference with SERRC to coordinate TA regarding Assistive Technology
October 29, 2010	Teleconference with DAC regarding Table 7, Part C to Part B transition, and correction of noncompliance.
December 1-3, 2010	<p>Meeting with SERRC regarding assistive technology, Part C to Part B transition, and general supervision system. Specifically On December 3, a meeting was held jointly with SERRC and DAC personnel to provide TA to the <i>Comité Asesor de Asistencia Tecnológica</i> (Assistive Technology Advisory Committee, 'CAAT' by its Spanish acronym) personnel.</p> <p>On-site Intensive TA Visit: December 2-3, 2010</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reviewed technical assistance plan with interim Associate Secretary. Facilitated meeting with PRDE and PRDH and discussed communication for children transitioning from Part C to Part B.</li> <li>2. Met with AT staff and reviewed policies and procedures for the provision of assistive technology devices and services to students with disabilities. Reviewed current methods for purchasing, inventorying, and disseminating assistive technology devices.</li> <li>3. Reviewed collection of self-assessment data and schedule for on-site monitoring visits to districts and regional Service centers with Monitoring and Compliance Unit. Reviewed correction of non-compliance that was identified during the previous monitoring cycle.</li> </ol> <p>Reviewed Memo 09-02 with Monitoring and Compliance Unit and procedures that needed to be included in the Monitoring Manual</p>
January 18-19, 2011	<p>DAC meeting was held regarding data manage activities such as: meeting with SEASWEB contractors and Ed facts coordinator to prepare for February 2011 data submission.</p> <p>Complete Data Routines outline for Table 1 and Table 3</p>
March 2-3, 2011	<p>Training was held with SERRC and Mr. Art Cernosia to provide Administrative Law Judges Training regarding an overview of Special Education Law. The key topic was a summary of the current statutory and regulatory requirements. References were made to a series of Questions and Answer documents prepared by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, from the USDE.</p>
April 14-15, 2011	<p>Meetings were held with DAC personnel to discuss the organizational understanding of the Chain of data (entry, processing, validation, verification, Communications and data submission).</p> <p>Continue to develop of the PRDE Data Management Manual.</p> <p>Develop preliminary data reports on district performance.</p>

Meeting Dates	Key Topics
April 18-20, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; SERRC and DAC meetings were held regarding monitoring activities, self-assessment, correction of previously identified non-compliance and enforcement sanctions.</li> <li>&gt; Conducted self-assessment with Monitoring Unit and compared performance to their performance in 2011 to 2008.</li> <li>&gt; Reviewed monitoring activities for 2010-2011: district self-assessment results, method of selection of districts for on-site monitoring, correction of previously identified non-compliance, and enforcement/sanctions for noncompliance past one year.</li> </ul> <p>Planned agenda for the Administrator’s workshop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Conducted APR work session for 2012 submission, reviewed calendar of due dates.</li> </ul>
May 26-27, 2011 May 30-June 1,2011	<p>Preparation for the Administrator’s Workshop.</p> <p>During May 31- July 1, the Administrator’s Workshop took place. The participants were School Superintendents, Special Education Facilitators, CSEE Directors and SAEE personnel. Included review of the SPP/APR indicators for both results and compliance, role of compliance monitoring, correction, enforcement and sanctions in general supervision, data entry and reporting, and dispute resolution</p> <p>Topics discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRDE Authority and Responsibility for General Supervision</li> <li>• Special Conditions</li> <li>• Overview of the SPP/APR</li> <li>• General Supervisión Responsibilities in Puerto Rico</li> <li>• Integrated Monitoring Activities                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions Component of General Supervision</li> <li>• Effective Dispute Resolution Components of General Supervision</li> <li>• Data on Processes and Results Component of General Supervision</li> <li>• Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development component of General Supervision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Assistive Technology</li> </ul> <p>Participated in OSEP CrEAG calls</p>

*Looking Forward to 2011-2012*

During 2011-2012, PRDE SAEE’s work with SERRC and DAC will focus in large part on:

- Producing a data progress report that compares performance for the state on select 618 data and APR data over a three or four year period.
- Expanding the draft data management manual that includes minimally 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.
- Facilitating the provision of professional learning and development for transition planning and implementation.
- Continuing facilitation of Communications and coordination between PRDE and PRDH.
- Assisting in the development of routine communication procedures between legal and special education divisions.
- Continuing to review the monitoring manual and activities to assist PRDE in evaluating the effectiveness of the procedures.

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.
4. Continue to implement the monitoring cycles to entities providing special education services.	PRDE has continued to follow its annual monitoring cycle. As discussed in prior APRs, PRDE's monitoring cycles are based in part on the results of the self-assessment. Additionally, as discussed above, the MCU's annual monitoring cycle now includes on-site visits to the CSEEs as well.
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 to ensure a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities and interconnectedness between the MCU's identified findings and technical assistance.
6. Incorporate the use of the data from the special education information system, as part of the monitoring efforts.	As part of the monitoring process data from SEAS WEB is being used to select the files which are reviewed during on-site monitoring visits. This exercise serves multiple purposes such as: validation of the data system and implementing the use of the data system as part of the monitoring process.
7. Train and provide technical assistance regarding compliance to the educational system.	See discussion above. PRDE's Administrator's Workshop, discussed above, held on May 30-June 1, 2011, was a particularly powerful technical assistance activity that PRDE plans to continue holding annually.

**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 2010

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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009: 100%**

**Data from Table 7 (FFY 2009):**

- (1) # of written, signed complaints received (total): 67
  - (1.1) #of complaints with reports issued: 59
    - (a) # of reports with findings of noncompliance: 34
    - (b) # of reports within timeline: 57
    - (c) # of reports within extended timelines: 2
  - (1.2) Complaints pending: 0
    - a) # of complaints pending a due process hearing: 0
  - (1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed: 8

**FFY 2010 Measurement:**

Data Year	1.1 (b)	1.1(C)	1.1
2010-2011	57	2	59

Data Year	1.1 (b) + 1.1 (c)	Divided by 1.1	Times 100	= Percent
2010-2011	59	1	100.00	100%

**Discussion of improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

PRDE met the mandatory 100% target for Indicator 16 for FFY 2010. This is the third 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 for the third year in a row is evident through a review of PRDE’s APR submissions and its special condition reports relating to State Complaints over prior years.

From FFY 2004 to FFY 2010, PRDE's compliance under Indicator 16 has increased steadily and quite rapidly considering the full circumstances, in an impressive fashion. For each of those years, PRDE reported the following levels of compliance with Indicator 16:

FFY 2004 (Baseline/SPP)	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY2010
0%	2.78%	56.04%	92.65%	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 relating 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 2010 has continued into FFY 2011. In fact, PRDE is proud to report that it is in 100% compliance under this indicator for FFY 2011 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, and 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.

Currently, the PRDE SELD uses the Legal Register Information System to enter and keep track of all the State complaints. PRDE plans to incorporate this system as part of a proposed integrated web-based system in which due process complaints, lawsuits and other legal matters will be recorded. One key purpose of this integrated web based system is to provide a global overview of the cases dealt with in the Legal Division regarding special education services. This proposed integrated system will make it easier to identify and investigate the background of each case. Specific to State Complaints, the Investigators and the Lawyers will have access to the system and will register all steps of the process completed with each complaint. This System will allow all personnel involved in the State Complaint process to know the exact status of each complaint and will help PRDE to maintain the compliance with the timelines.

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 2010. 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 2010. 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.
Activity	Discussion
5. Evaluate resources and seek to hire new personnel to work with the state complaint process as determined appropriate (likely an additional investigator and an additional lawyer).	As discussed above, PRDE has monitored the State Complaint workload and has determined that current staffing levels are 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 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 2010

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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 2010-2011	100%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 77.7%

Data from Table 7 (FFY 2010):

Data Year	3.2—Hearings (fully adjudicated)	3.2(a)—Decisions within timeline	3.2(b)—Decisions within appropriately extended timeline
2010-2011	900	620	79

FFY 2010 Measurement:

Data Year	3.2(a) + 3.2(b)	3.2	[3.2(a) + 3.2(b)] / 3.2	Times 100	= Percent
2010-2011	699	900	699/900=0.7767	0.7767x100=77.67	77.7%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

PRDE's sustained efforts to focus on improving the management of and compliance with the due-process hearing timelines has resulted in continued improvement with Indicator 17 compared to prior years. PRDE significantly improved performance with this indicator for FFY 2010. The percentage of due-

process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party for FFY 2010 was 77.7%, which reflects an 8.5% increase from FFY 2009. The following chart demonstrates PRDE's marked improvement with this indicator as compared over the past five years.

<b>PRDE Performance on Ind. 17, FFY 2006-FFY 2010</b>				
<b>FFY 2006 APR</b>	<b>FFY 2007 APR</b>	<b>FFY 2008 APR</b>	<b>FFY 2009 APR</b>	<b>FFY 2010 APR</b>
51.5%	50.1%	52.8%	69.2%	<b>77.7%</b>

To date, PRDE has been able to verify that over 99% of all due process complaints filed during FFY 2010 have been closed.

Throughout FFY 2010, PRDE's Secretarial Unit, the office which oversees due process complaint hearing requests, monitored due process hearing officers, running monthly reports reflecting each hearing officer's performance with compliance issues including the timelines of handling due process complaints. The monthly monitoring reports address a number of issues including the status of all cases assigned to the hearing officer and the number of days elapsed since the date the complaint was assigned. Complaints that have exceeded the timelines are noted, as are complaints that have had their timelines appropriately extended. Statistical reports for each judge include the number of complaints assigned and the number of complaints that have been fully adjudicated. The Secretarial Unit holds individual meetings with the hearing officers where issues regarding caseload and management of cases are discussed. Where the Secretarial Unit has determined that a hearing officer failed to properly extend a timeline, those decisions and explanations are explained during these individual meetings.

PRDE continues to see an increase in the number of due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within a properly extended timeline, which is reflective of PRDE's efforts in training its hearing officers and revising its 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 through resolution meetings and mediations, contribute to the overall timely resolution of due-process complaints filed. In considering the entire universe of due-process complaints filed during FFY 2010, PRDE resolved 82% of those complaints in a timely manner, a continued improvement from prior years as reflected in the table below. This calculation accounts for all complaints filed during FFY 2010 that were timely resolved, including resolution of FFY 2010 complaints that were resolved timely although after July 1, 2011 as well as complaints that were timely resolved through non-adversarial means, e.g., through resolution or mediation agreements.

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

*Analysis by Month: Overcoming Previously Identified Challenges*

PRDE has recognized that there are two periods during the year that have presented special challenges to PRDE to comply with the 45-day timeline to issue resolutions: the winter holiday season and the summertime. During these periods it can be particularly difficult to summon the parties because many are on vacation for quite lengthy periods. PRDE has actively worked to combat these challenges. Beginning in FFY 2009, PRDE implemented focused efforts to produce improved results during these periods. These efforts continued in FFY 2010 and have in fact improved results.

In the FFY 2009 APR, Puerto Rico provided a chart analyzing monthly performance with timely resolution of due process complaints comparing FFY 2008 to FFY 2009. The following chart adds monthly performance from FFY 2010 and includes a cumulative comparison in monthly performance from FFY 2008 to FFY 2010. The month listed reflects the month in which the due process complaint was filed. As reflected below, PRDE has improved compliance overall during every single month of the year, with the most significant improvements occurring for the months that initially reflected the lowest performance.

Month	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	Change FFY 2008 to FFY 2009	Change FFY 2009 to FFY 2010	Absolute Change FFY 2008 to FFY 2010
July	34.4%	61.9%	69%	+27.5%	+7.1%	+34.6
August	60.9%	71.4%	67%	+10.5%	-4.4%	+6.1
September	55.8%	57.1%	74%	+1.3%	+16.9%	+18.2%
October	48.0%	67.6%	73%	+19.6%	+5.4%	+25%
November	36.2%	45.2%	84%	+9.0%	+38.8%	+47.8%
December	63.5%	43.1%	88%	-20.4%	+44.9%	+25.3%
January	60.7%	80.2%	83%	+19.5%	+2.8%	+12.3%
February	69.0%	88.3%	79%	+19.3%	-9.3%	+10%
March	81.4%	88.2%	83%	+6.8%	-5.2%	+1.6%
April	62.4%	76.7%	92%	+14.3%	+15.3%	+29.6%
May	23.7%	68.7%	100%	+45.0%	+31.3%	+76.3%
June	22.9%	62.0%	100%	+39.1%	+38%	+77.1%

The most marked improvement has occurred with regard to the months in which PRDE has proactively worked to ensure improved compliance (winter holiday season and summertime). For FFY 2010, PRDE achieved 100% compliance with the timeliness requirements for due process complaints filed during May and June 2011, which reflects steady improvements from FFY 2008 to FFY 2009 and on to FFY 2010, with overall improvements of more than 75% for each of those months. Similarly, PRDE has demonstrated significant improvement with compliance with timelines for due process complaints filed during October, November, and December, the months leading into the winter holiday season. Overall improvement from FFY 2008 to FFY 2010 for these months improved by 25%, 47.8%, and 25.3%, respectively. PRDE's increased monitoring and vigilant focus on ensuring compliance during these months has certainly contributed to significant improvement in performance.

Additionally, PRDE notes the upward trend in compliance throughout the progression of FFY 2010. This reflects a systemic improvement with compliance with this requirement over time, the results of PRDE's emphasis and steadfast focus on this compliance requirement overall.

#### *Additional Discussion of Improvement Activities*

During FFY 2010, PRDE hired several new hearing officers, and all hearing officer contracts were in place by July 1, 2010 allowing them to begin work under their 2010-2011 contracts with no delays at the start of their contract period. That all contracts were in place in time for new judges to begin working immediately on July 1, 2010 reflects PRDE's planning and focus on ensuring compliance with due process hearing timelines during FFY 2010. Hearing officers were trained on IDEA and special education requirements, including the appropriate extension of time for due process complaint resolution. Most of the newly selected judge's came to PRDE with extensive experience as hearing officers with other agencies.

During FFY 2010, to ensure sustained involvement towards compliance, PRDE continued with the improvement activities outlined in the SPP, as reflected in the table below.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p>1. Include due process procedures as part of the Statewide Personnel Development System to ensure personnel's understanding and implementation of adequate processes.</p>	<p>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. Due process is included in the trainings. Training has also been provided to the School Facilitators, who began working within the SAEE structure in FFY 2010.</p>
<p>2. Request administrative judges to make an explanation of the reasons for resolutions being issued after 45 days timeline.</p>	<p>There is continuous communication with the hearing officers to request written explanations for every resolution issued after the 45-day timeline that was not appropriately extended. The requirement to provide these explanations is incorporated into their yearly contracts.</p> <p>In FFY 2010, following submission of the required written explanation reports discussed immediately above, individual meetings were held with each hearing officer to discuss agency-wide compliance with this requirement as well as their individual record of compliance with this requirement. A copy of these monthly hearing officer monitoring reports, which are discussed above in the narrative, is handed to each of the judges, the Secretary of Education and the SAEE.</p>
<p>3. Continue to inform administrative judges on due process requests that are near the 45 days' timeline expiration.</p>	<p>Throughout FFY 2010, PRDE continued to send monthly reports to hearing officers alerting them of upcoming timeline expirations and asking for explanation for those cases.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Activity	Discussion
4. Continue periodic training, continuing education, for administrative law judges.	<p>Several training sessions were held with the hearing officers during FFY 2010, including the following:</p> <p><b>July 2, 2010</b> - Training for newly appointed judges on laws and regulations, including the terms for issuing resolutions and appropriate extensions of time, among other topics.</p> <p><b>October 14 and November 12, 2010</b> - Compliance with Indicator #17, the appropriate extension of timelines, and other factors affecting compliance.</p> <p><b>March 3, 2011</b> - IDEA Training, and due process administrative hearing updates.</p> <p><b>July 7 and 12-13, 2011</b> - Discussion of the Report on the Administrative Work of Administrative Judges of Special Education (i.e., the monthly Secretarial Unit monitoring reports of hearing officer caseloads discussed above) and individual and group compliance with the procedure of administrative hearings during FFY 2010.</p>
5. Encourage and publicize resolution session option to complainants.	<p>There is an information sheet on the availability of resolution meetings at the Service centers; it is also provided when parents are filing a due process complaint. PRDE personnel encourage the use of the resolution meeting as an alternative for solving any dispute. Resolution meeting facilitators (staff responsible for holding the resolution sessions) are located at the service centers for parents' easy access and closeness to the schools and school districts.</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 SAEE's Procedures Manual. SAEE's website now has a section dedicated to Due Process.</p> <p>PRDE has developed and provides a brochure on options to complainants, such as resolution meetings, medication, and due process hearings. As discussed regarding mediations (see Indicator 19), this brochure is being reviewed and discussed with the RLV plaintiff class.</p>
6. Re-train personnel on the due process procedures including the newly incorporated Resolution Meeting processes.	<p>The Resolution process has been fully integrated into the service structure of PRDE.</p> <p>Re-trainings continue island-wide.</p>

Activity	Discussion
7. Review and amend contracts to be used with the administrative judges to specifically include compliance with timeline requirements.	The contracts were revised to include a clause requiring full compliance with IDEA 45 day timeline for due process complaint resolution, including the appropriate timelines extension. The contracts are renewed every year and include this clause.
8. Include in the information system a system for issuing alerts identifying due process cases that are approaching the end of their timelines.	<p>The information system that supports the due process procedures was modified in FFY 2008 to create reports indicating timeline compliance status. PRDE SAE developed a manual for proper operation of the information system, a manual with both technical and procedural aspects of data entry and validation.</p> <p>PRDE programmers are preparing to incorporate additional enhancements to the system. Their work is currently awaiting recommendations from the experts newly appointed by the court in the RLV case, as well as the recommended updates from the RLV plaintiff class.</p>
Conduct a needs study to determine training area needs for administrative judges.	PRDE continuously seeks and obtains input from the hearing officers regarding their training area needs and requests. Input was received from the hearing officers in all of the meetings and training sessions PRDE conducted and arranged for them. PRDE's training schedule and training session agendas reflect the feedback received.
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 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 2010**

**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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 2010-2011	51.5%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010:** 61.5%

During FFY 2010, 61.5% (375/610) of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements as reported in Table 7.

**FFY 2010 Measurement:**

Data year	3.1 (a) Settlement Agreements	3.1 Resolutions Sessions Held	3.1 (a) Divided by 3.1	= Percent
2010-2011	375	610	375/610 = 0.6147	61.5%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

During 2010-2011, 610 resolution sessions were held, 375 of which resulted in settlement agreements. As a result, 61.47% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through a resolution settlement agreement. PRDE's FFY 2010 results for indicator 18 very closely mirror PRDE's FFY 2009 results, 61.97%. PRDE met its FFY 2010 measurable and rigorous target of 51.5%. A copy of Puerto Rico's FFY 2010 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 during FFY 2010, 56% felt listened to, 80% felt respected, and 66% felt engaged in the discussion and decision making process. Regarding special education staff involved in the resolution process, 73% of those surveyed indicated the staff involved demonstrated the necessary knowledge and management of the subject matter—both generally and case-specific. Only 5% of those surveyed reported that they were 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 formal on-site monitoring visits during FFY 2009 to all CSEEs, including each CSEE's Resolution Meeting Division. Two findings of non-compliance were identified during these visits and, as such, are included in Puerto Rico's FFY 2010 B-15 Worksheet (see Indicator 15). In FFY 2010, the Monitoring Unit held follow-up visits and, in accordance with its monitoring procedures, verified that both of these findings had been corrected within a year of identification.</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 2009. 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>

Activities	Discussion
4. Continue to design and provide trainings to the investigators/facilitators to further train them in dispute resolution and conflict management.	PRDE continued this activity, meetings were held with mediators and conciliators. They were also included in the Administrator's Workshop. Additionally, the MCU provided technical assistance during monitoring visits.
5. Continue to design and provide training to all other relevant personnel (including process, forms, best practices, etc.).	See progress reported for activity # 4 above.
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.
8. Implement parental evaluation regarding the resolution session experience.	During FFY 2010, PRDE revised the parental evaluation / satisfaction survey to make it more user-friendly and to improve its overall usefulness. Additionally, the revisions were designed to allow PRDE to systemize tabulation of the responses. Please see the discussion above

**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**

**2010 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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 2010-2011	65%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 93.2%**

Data from Table 7 (FFY 2010) 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
2010-2011	263	38	323

Measurement

Data Year	2.1 (a)(i) + 2-1 (b)(i)	Divided by 2.1	Multiplied by 100	Percentage/Measurement
2010-2011	301	$301/323 = 0.9319$	$0.9319 \times 100 = 93.19$	93.2%

**Discussion of improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

During FFY 2010, 301 of the 323 mediations held (93.2%) resulted in mediation agreements. Two hundred sixty-three of the mediations resulting in agreements were related to due process hearings; the remaining 38 mediations resulting in agreements were not related to due process complaints. Puerto Rico exceeded its FFY 2010 target (65%) and increased its FFY 2009 rate of mediations resulting in mediation agreements (73.97%).

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 voluntarily 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 SAEЕ 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.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p>1. Include mediation as part of the statewide Personnel Development System to ensure adequate comprehension and implementation of mediation process.</p>	<p>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.</p>

Activity	Discussion
2. Disseminate mediation process to schools and public.	<p>During FFY 2009, PRDE approved a new <i>Procedures Manual for the Secretaria1 Unit</i>, as well as new model forms for filing a due process complaint and requesting a mediation not related to a due process complaint. As reported in the FFY 2008 APR, final approval of these documents 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.</p> <p>Since the approval of the new manual, SAEE has used this procedures manual to help guide its activities and help to ensure that it implements its mediation process in a uniform manner across the island.</p> <p>When a parent registers a child for special education, be it in the school or 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.	During FFY 2010, PRDE decided that collection of evaluation feedback was not necessary at that time. PRDE is considering the usefulness and approach to collecting evaluation feedback for FFY 2011.
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.

Activity	Discussion
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 2010, 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 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**

**2010 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	Mesurable and Rigores Target
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2010: 95.02%**

PRDE has computed its actual target data for the FFY 2010 APR in accordance with the OSEP tables for Indicator 20 Data Rubric. The completed tables appear below.

<b>SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20</b>			
<b>APR Indicator</b>	<b>Valid and Reliable</b>	<b>Correct Calculation</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	N/A	N/A	0
10	N/A	N/A	0
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	36
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on- time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		41.00

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3- Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 4- Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6- State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/11	1	0	0	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	19
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.143) =</b>		40.72

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	41.00
B. 618 Grand Total	40.72
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	81.72
Total N/A in APR	4
Total N/A in 618	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>86.00</b>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.950
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	95.02

\* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.143 for 618

**Discussion of improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010:**

PRDE achieved 95.02% on Indicator 20. This is a slight decrease from PRDE's FFY 2009 measurement of 97.78%, PRDE remains in substantial compliance with this indicator.

#### 618 Data Collection and Validation Activities

Most of the data required by Section 618 of IDEA are submitted through Ed Facts. The data manager from PRDE works closely with the Ed Facts coordinator to compare requirements received from OSEP to the requirements received from Ed Facts. Counts created by Ed Facts staff and the PRDE data manager are compared. When the counts reconcile, the PRDE data manager approves the Ed Facts reports for submission. If they do not reconcile, staff work together to discover and rectify the sources of any discrepancy.

#### APR Data Collection and Verification Activities

To learn of changes to data reporting requirements and/or new data reporting requirements as soon as possible, the PRDE data manager participates in the DAC/OSEP technical assistance calls, attends the OSEP meetings that include data as a topic, and participates in online discussions with other members of the data managers' listserv. Also, PRDE has received extensive technical assistance from the Data Accountability Center (DAC). Validation activities include electronic edit checks in the databases. Verification efforts included comparing data from the system to data recorded manually from all of the service centers and school districts

To credibly report progress toward intended results and to enable performance-informed decision-making, PRDE needs to ensure that data are accurate, reliable, and valid. Verification includes assessing data completeness, accuracy, and consistency and related quality control practices. Validation is the assessment of whether the data are appropriate to measure performance.

PRDE requires the full implementation of data verification and validation criteria to ensure that information is properly collected, recorded, processed, and aggregated for reporting and use by decision makers. The work consists of a variety of methods to assess and verify data accuracy and timeliness issues. For example, PRDE:

- Performed quality checks of submitted data to identify common errors.

- Provided technical assistance to target these common errors and provide guidance on how to report correctly problematic data elements; i.e., data fields.

- Worked closely with CSEEs, districts, and/or schools that have had problems with reporting accurate data.

- Tracked data on an on-going basis and reviewed monthly to determine if action points in the process are needed.

During the 2010-2011 school year, PRDE staff continued and expanded validity testing as part of the overall submission process. Districts/Schools have several opportunities within each reporting period to examine error reports and correct student data. The electronic data validations and error reports will continue in the future. Through continued training and targeted technical assistance, PRDE expects to continually increase the reliability and validity of the data. PRDE will increase its activities designed to identify Districts/Schools that have questionable data and require these Districts/Schools to examine their data and their practices to either verify the data as submitted are correct or correct data entry or submission errors.

Trainings conducted in 2010-2011 included detailed instructions on both reporting of individual student special education data and the intended use of the data for the submission of Part B Indicators. Trainings were hosted and attended by regional personnel, District Superintendents, and CSEE staff who will provide technical assistance on issues regarding data. Increased and updated training will be provided during the 2011-2012 school year to address specific areas of concern with validation of data.

As discussed throughout the APR, in FFY 2010 PRDE employed School Facilitators. Collaboration with them has been key to obtaining data for this indicator which impacts other indicators as well.

Activities	Discussion
1. Continue to train special education personnel and other related staff in the new data based information system.	See discussion above. This is a continuous activity. These trainings are attended by new teachers, directors and other new personnel, including school facilitators.
2. Continue with implementation of our data base information system island wide.	Throughout 2010-2011, PRDE continued implementation of the database information system island wide. PRDE is continuing its efforts to build the technological culture, including comfort level with SEASWeb, throughout PRDE.  PRDE's Special Education Data Unit has made collaboration with other units of the Special Education Office a priority in order to ensure the ongoing work with the data based information system. PRDE will continue to ensure integrated monitoring activities.
3. Incorporate new elements to the data system to improve in our data collection and reporting (Transportation, Assistive technology, Appointments coordination)  Complaints / Due Process Hearings	As discussed in the APR Supplemental Report, over the past year (FFY 2010), PRDE has enhanced its electronic tracking of assistive technology equipment orders from initial order through to delivery. This was a significant data collection accomplishment for PRDE in FFY 2010.

**Revisions, with Justify, 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.

**List of Acronyms**

1. AA-AAS- Alternative Assessment against Alternate Achievement Standards
2. AAFET- *La Administration para el Adiestramiento de Futuros Empresarios y Trabajadores*

- (Administration for the Training of Future Business Owners and Workers)
3. APNI- *Asociación de Padres con Niños con Impedimentos* (Association of Parents of Children with Disabilities)
  4. APR- Annual Performance Report
  5. AT (assistive technology)
  6. CAAT- *Comité Asesor de Asistencia Tecnológica* (Assistive Technology Advisory Committee)
  7. CASA- *Proyecto Casa (ASPIRA)*
  8. CrEAG - Critical Elements Analysis Guide
  9. CSEE- *Centros de Servicio de Educación Especial* (Special Education Service Center)
  10. CSPR- Consolidated State Performance Report
  11. DAC- - Data Accountability Center
  12. ED- United States Department of Education
  13. FFY- Federal Fiscal Year
  14. IDEA- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act
  15. IEP- Individualized Education Program
  16. MCU- Monitoring and Compliance Unit
  17. MOA-Memorandum of Agreement
  18. MOU- Memorandum of Understanding
  19. NSTTAC- National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center
  20. OPPI- Puerto Rico Office of the Advocate for Persons with Disabilities
  21. OSEP- Office of Special Education Programs
  22. PCARDS- Purchase Cards
  23. PPA- *Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico*
  24. PPEA- *Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Evaluación Alternativa*
  25. PRDE-Puerto Rico Department of Education
  26. PRDH- Puerto Rico Department of Health
  27. RLV- Rosa Lydia Vélez
  28. SAAE - *Secretaría Asociada de Educación Especial* (PRDE Office of the Associate Secretary of Special Education)
  29. SEA- State Educational Agency
  30. SEASWEB- PRDE's Special Education Data System
  31. SELD- PRDE Special Education Legal Division
  32. SERRC- Southeast Regional Resource Center
  33. SIFDE- *Sistema de Información Financiera del Departamento de Educación* (Department of Education Financial Information System, PRDE's financial system)
  34. SIS- Student Information System
  35. SPP- State Performance Plan
  36. TA-Technical Assistance