

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The 2017-2018 school year was a uniquely challenging time for Puerto Rico. It was a year where Mother Nature demonstrated its fury towards our Island, but at the same time, Puerto Ricans demonstrated their resilience. Two significant hurricanes hit Puerto Rico back-to-back (Hurricanes Irma and María) during September 2017. On September 4, 2017, Hurricane Irma hit the Island, and as a result, approximately 800 households were without electricity. Two weeks later, on September 20, 2017, Hurricane María made landfall on the island of Puerto Rico as a high-end Category 4, nearly Category 5, hurricane with winds of 175-190 mph. Hurricane María is considered the 2nd most catastrophic Hurricane that has hit Puerto Rico since Hurricane San Felipe in 1922. The eye of the Hurricane entered the island through Yabucoa in the Region of Humacao on the eastern side of the Island, where our SSIP is being implemented. Flooding affected all areas of Puerto Rico, with water levels reaching as high as six feet in some areas and numerous buildings losing their roofs. Hurricane María significantly damaged infrastructure, disabling radar and cell towers severely impacting communications within the island, and completely knocking out electricity across the island. The entire Island was left without electricity. The electricity slowly started coming back in late November 2017, 2 months after the Hurricane, and power was established in more than 70% of the island by late February 2018. Governor Ricardo Roselló estimated the damages caused by María to be at least 90 billion dollars in damages.

In the aftermath of Hurricane María, a large number of PRDE public schools served as shelters for families and individuals. This saved the lives of those Puerto Ricans whose homes were not safely inhabitable. Schools were serving not only as shelters but also as points of access for their communities for food, as health clinics, and as centers for children. Additionally, several schools were closed and unable to serve these key roles for their communities following the hurricanes due to the significant levels of damages to their structure. It was over a month after Hurricane María hit, not until October 23, 2017, that the first PRDE schools officially re-opened to once again provide academic services. A total of 119 schools, just 11% of PRDE schools that existed at the start of the 2017-2018 school year, re-opened on October 23, 2017. PRDE continued to re-open schools as aggressively as safely possible. By November 7, 2017, PRDE had been able to re-open approximately half to the schools that existed at the start of the 2017-2018 school year. The last schools to re-open were from the Humacao Region, on December 14, 2017, nearly two months after the Hurricane made landfall in Puerto Rico. A total of approximately 20 schools that existed at the start of the 2017-2018 school year never re-opened due to severe damages sustained as a result of the hurricanes.

Regarding the structure of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE), PRDE operates as a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rico Secretary of Education leads the PRDE and has two principal sub-secretaries: one focused on academic affairs, and the second focused on administrative affairs. The Central Level office includes the Secretariat of Special Education ("SAEE by its acronym in Spanish), which is responsible for overseeing the management and implementation of the requirements with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act ("IDEA") and is headed by the Puerto Rico Associate Secretary for Special Education. Puerto Rico Law 51 provides autonomy to the SAEE and establishes that the Puerto Rico Associate Secretary for Special Education responds directly to the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education.

In 2018, PRDE established a new administrative structure, which eliminates the previously existing 28 School Districts, but maintains and works to strengthen the seven previously existing educational regions, which are based on geography. The regions are headquartered at the seven Educational Regional Offices (OREs by its acronym in Spanish): Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Humacao, Mayagüez, Ponce, and San Juan. Each Regional Office is composed of the following positions and units:

- **Regional Director** is in charge of all matters of the ORE and responds to the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education and Associate Secretary for Special Education.
- **Chief Academic Officer** is in charge of all Academic Facilitators (including academic facilitators for Special Education), school improvement, academic support, basic curriculum: Spanish, English, Math, Science. Also, they are in charge of the complementary curriculum, for example: Social Studies, Health, Physical Education, Arts, Vocational Studies and Special Education. The
- **Student Services Officer** is in charge of the direct services for students and social support such as: counselors, nurses and social workers.
- **Student Services Unit** also oversees the adult education program, at-risk students' education, and special education (including the corresponding Special Education Service Centers).
- **School Officer** is in charge of providing support to the School Directors, i.e., Principals.
- **Accountability Unit** is responsible for work related to the Puerto Rico Academic Assessments, Monitoring, and Data Coaching.
- **Chief Operating Officer** is responsible for federal funds, fiscal issues, and information systems.
- **Auxiliary Services** oversees the school cafeterias, school maintenance, all school transportation, security and others. Human Resources personnel hiring, professional development and personnel evaluation.
- **Legal Division Unit** oversees and manages legal issues and complaints, including and special education complaints.

During FFY 2017 and since the issuance of OSEP's determinations on June 30, 2018, PRDE SAEE has received technical assistance from outside sources such as USDE-funded technical assistance centers. For the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE SAEE continued participating in the NCSI Math Book Club, the participation in which is positively impacting PRDE's SSIP activities. For the third phase second submission of the SSIP, NCSI representatives working with PRDE provided feedback and support to PRDE in preparing its report. The Math Collaborative helps all States with the same theme to help and collaborate together through our struggles in implementation of the SSIP. NCSI has helped us in the engagement of the School Directors with the project providing us with tools and resources that have been very helpful. NCSI support has also been of great help to PRDE in other areas such as fiscal, PBIS, RTI, and others. The technical assistance received has been of great value to PRDE SAEE in making decisions related to its SSIP implementation, and particularly regarding PRDE's approach to evaluation of the SSIP efforts.

During the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE determined one area of focus would be the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). While PBIS is a PRDE system-wide initiative, the SAEE has been involved throughout the planning and implementation processes as a key stakeholder. After all the initial planning, including the establishment of a PBIS workplan, implementation was delayed due to the impacts of Hurricane María. The work plan was established for 856 schools which include the primary grades PK-8th grade.

During the second semester of the 2017-2018 school year, the Directors of the OREs were asked to identify PBIS teams in their respective regions. PRDE worked with the dissemination of informative material about the purpose and benefit of the PBIS Plan. During the period from January 2018 to April 2018, PRDE worked to get contracting and scheduling in place for professional adaptation and coaching workshops related to the PBIS Plan. Continued monitoring was offered to companies to deliver their work schedules (i.e., workshops and coaching) to be able to continuously monitor and surprise the offer of them. The PBIS teams of the seven OREs were trained in *PBIS-Informed in Trauma and Culturally Appropriate through the Fine Arts*. Finally, monitoring visits were carried out to ensure compliance with the Plan and the faithful implementation of PBIS by the companies.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

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

The SAEE general supervision system includes many components and is carried out at all levels of the PRDE system.

At the Central Level, the SAEE has a Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU), which is responsible for monitoring throughout the Commonwealth to ensure compliance with IDEA and Puerto Rico requirements. The MCU carries out monitoring activities of implementation of IDEA at the ORE and school levels. The MCU is responsible for issuing findings when noncompliance is identified as

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

well as providing necessary follow-up to ensure findings of non-compliance are corrected in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification.

PRDE SAEЕ carries out work at the regional level with significant support from its Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs, by its acronym in Spanish). The SAEЕ oversees a total of eleven CSEEs in operation. The CSEEs are located in Aguada, Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Fajardo, Humacao, Mayagüez, Morovis, Ponce, San Germán, and San Juan. They operate as a link with PRDE's educational regions, with some regions having more than one CSEE based on specific needs, and were established to provide and assist students with disabilities and their parents with special education services. The services they provide include registration, parent consent to evaluation, evaluations (Indicator 11), eligibility determination processes, re-evaluations, and coordination of therapy services. The CSEEs are a key component of PRDE's General Supervision System; they have the responsibility of ensuring compliance with Indicators 11 and 12 and ensuring services are provided in a timely manner.

Another important main responsibility of the CSEEs is to serve as the liaison for children transitioning from Part C to B and their parents, including with regard to their referral from Part C, evaluation, and provision of services. During FFY 2015, the Government of Puerto Rico established an initiative to positively impact the timely transition from Part C to Part B. Under this initiative, staff from the Puerto Rico Department of Health who work on the Part C program are physically located on the same premises as Part B staff in order to aid in communication and collaboration with the transition process. The location in which the staff is located is call the Integrated Service Center (*Centro de Servicios Integrados*). The initiative started as a pilot project in the Caguas Region in November 2015. This pilot effort has been a great success, and parents have been pleased with this arrangement. It has helped improve the process and ensure a smooth transition from Part C to Part B services. PRDE has been communicating with OSEP constantly regarding this matter and during April 2016 OSEP visited the facilities in Caguas and Fajardo (the initiative expanded during the 2016-2017 school year to a second Service Center which is Fajardo) observing the benefits for parents with children with disabilities. During 2017-2018 SAEЕ continued with the same two Integrated CSEEs with great satisfaction and feedback from parents.

The CSEEs have the Assistive Technology Advisory Committees (CAAT by its acronym in Spanish). This committee includes the professional experts who have the responsibility of providing the assistive technology evaluations.

The PRDE Special Education Legal Division (SELD) is responsible for receiving and investigating State Complaints. When findings of noncompliance are identified through the investigation of a State Complaint, the SELD is charged with issuing the notification of finding as well as with providing the necessary follow-up to ensure findings of noncompliance are corrected in a timely manner.

The PRDE Secretarial Unit is the unit charged with managing due process complaints. The Secretarial Unit's responsibilities include the hiring and training of hearing officers, and Mediators, as well as follow-up activities to ensure hearings are held and complaints fully adjudicated within a timely manner.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

PRDE SAEЕ has a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) that is responsible for setting public policy on educational aspects. The TAU is comprised of individuals who work with the following areas: deaf, blind and deaf-blind, private schools (purchase of services), pre-school transition (619 Coordinator), post-secondary transition, Autism, adaptive physical education, and assistive technology. Additionally, these individuals coordinate activities related to teaching support and technical assistance to schools through the Special Education Facilitators. They also prepare and implement the professional development plan of the SAEЕ. Additionally, each TAU staff member is designated as the team member with special expertise in a specific subject matter(s) (e.g., adaptative physical education, secondary transition, blind or visually impaired students, pre-school children) for which that member is available to the rest of the TAU staff members to provide assistance.

The TAU in their work plan are implementing on-going technical assistance during the school year with the purpose of improving compliance and or indicator performance, including providing professional development for the Special Education Facilitators, making sure the facilitators, teachers and students aids professional development needs are identified and attended to including providing them with tools on how to manage their daily work plan.

Throughout the 2017-2018 school year, SAEЕ provided on-going trainings to teachers, central level personnel, facilitators, monitors and other program staff on the program policies and procedures. The orientations have included how to complete evaluations and how to properly develop IEPs, among all other required procedures while providing services to students, and how to complete the files within the MiPE System (called MiPE Academies). The orientations have been carried out throughout the Island. Approximately 1,154 participants attended these training activities. In addition, the program issued a memorandum on March 13, 2018, to reinforce all procedures that must be carried out regarding initial and triannual determinations. This memorandum is a tool that all school and service center personnel can use as reference while providing services to eligible students. The memo was disseminated through official communications to ensure access to all PRDE staff.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

During February 2018, the TAU provided training on the process of Alternate Assessment. For this process, the Department identifies at least 2 Coordinators by ORE (Regional Educational Office) to work with the logistics of the alternate assessment and provide training to the teachers that will provide this method of evaluation. These coordinators are trained intensively every year to assure the process is done correctly. Also during February 2018, Technical Assistance was provided by all the personnel from the TAU in each Region on Post-Secondary Transition which included information impacting APR Indicators B13 and B14.

In March 2018, the TAU provided technical assistance to all the Special Education Facilitators. The themes covered were as follows: IEP and all of its components including measurable goals and objectives, APR Indicator B7 data collection including how to evaluate students adequately using the “Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar” (a translation of ECO’s COSF), Indicators B13 and B14 (including the secondary transition process), placement (how to identify the correct placement for a student and how to develop new placements), and the process for extended school year. Also in March 2018, the PR Parent Center (APNI by its acronym in Spanish) provided a whole day training on matters of Special Education to parents and special education personnel. The TAU also participated of these trainings.

During March, April and May 2018, Mi Portal Especial (“MiPE”) Academies were provided to special education school teachers. MiPE is PRDE’s special education information system. The MiPE Academies provided crucial professional development and technical assistance regarding proper and effective use of the information system.

Also in April 2018, the TAU participated in a consultation meeting with Private Schools regarding equitable services and answered questions regarding IDEA equitable services for parentally placed private school students with disabilities.

During June 11-15, 2018, Talleres Capacitacion Directores, capacity building workshops for School Directors, were held, which covered a variety of topics including: IEP development and provision of services, Federal and State compliance, and School Director responsibilities related special education.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

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

The PRDE Secretary of Education in coordination with the Undersecretary for Academic Affairs and the Associate Secretary for Special Education annually develops the Systemic Agenda (*Agenda Sistémica*) with the primary goal of providing uniform professional development at the start of the school year, including special education specific topics and themes, to all personnel at the school level across the island. PRDE continues to implement this strategy, holding the Systemic Agenda trainings for school personnel at the start of the new school year in the first week of August (the week before students return to schools). Among the themes discussed every year during the Systemic Agenda are: Compliance with IDEA Part B including discussion of the APR Part B Indicators, post-secondary transition, assistive technology, the Rosa Lydia Velez Case and related requirements, and parental rights, among others. The implementation of the Systemic Agenda training reflects PRDE’s Secretary priority that at least once a year all school personnel will receive the same professional development which will help ensure uniformity of processes and practices island-wide.

Additionally, the school calendar which has to be implemented in all PRDE schools establishes one day in each month (except for August which is a whole week) that is separated and dedicated completely for the professional development of all teachers. The themes for the professional development will vary by the needs of each ORE and they are the ones who establish the priority depending on the need.

Additionally, as discussed above under the Technical Assistance System section of this introduction, the SAEE TAU provides significant professional development on a variety of topics through its technical assistance and support efforts.

The Adaptive Physical Education (EFA by its acronym in Spanish) program from the central level has a coordinator assigned to each region. This coordinator is in charge of carrying out annual trainings for Academic Facilitators and school level personnel that covers a variety of topics including evaluation for determining eligibility for EFA and EFA processes and services. Moreover, these coordinators participate as necessary in IEP meetings in which technical assistance related to EFA may be helpful.

Regarding postsecondary transition, the SAEE reestablished the support of the transition coordinators in the CSEEs with the purpose of providing technical assistance related to postsecondary transition. They also provide support for the gathering and analysis of data for Indicators 13 and 14. Additionally, they provide support, as necessary, in IEP meetings.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

Our stakeholder group, called the *Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial* ("Special Education Advisory Committee"), is the committee responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization *Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos* (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEЕ personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEЕ personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group. In meetings with the *Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial*, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, in order to receive feedback and recommendations. Also, as soon as access to GRADS was available, SAEЕ personnel presented the platform to the stakeholder group and discussed each indicator with the stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education and were satisfied with the new system indicating that they believed it would help to prevent human errors and to ensure reliable data. Also, they have provided suggestions on how to improve the narrative discussion for each indicator, and how to make the APR a more user friendly document. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2017 APR.

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEЕ held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2017 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

PRDE has had a copy of its FFY 2016 SPP/APR as well as prior SPP/APRs available on its website at: <http://de.gobierno.pr/educacion-especialmenu/603-cumplimiento/1031-plan-de-desempeno-estatal-de-educacion-especial>. The FFY 2016 SPP/APR can be directly accessed at: <http://de.gobierno.pr/files/APR-2016B-PR-After-Clarifications.pdf>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2017 and 2018 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2018 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			55.14%	65.18%	65.50%	65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%	56.50%	56.60%
Data		55.14%	65.18%	52.00%	59.40%	59.40%	48.37%	46.70%	48.10%	56.54%	61.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	56.70%	56.80%
Data	72.55%	80.12%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	56.90%	57.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	null	4726
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	null	6,657
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table		Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

The GRADS system never populated Puerto Rico's data for Indicator 1. This happened the past three years as well. We discussed this matter with OSEP in prior years, and PRDE was informed that the data likely would not be pre-populated this year either. It appears this is due to PRDE's approved adjusted cohort graduation rate being a three-year rate rather than a four-year rate. As such, PRDE was forced to select the overwrite option and enter the data above manually. This data comes from Puerto Rico's School Year 2016-2017 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) Part II submission. PRDE also discussed with OSEP the fact that when using the overwrite data option for this indicator, the GRADS system allowed PRDE to enter raw data numbers but would not allow for the entry of any of the information labeling the data (e.g., 'Description' column).

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
4,726	6,657	80.12%	56.90%	70.99%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

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

As reported in previous APRs, PRDE requested a deadline extension for reporting the four-year graduation rate data required under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(4)(ii)(a). In response to the PRDE's deadline extension request, a letter was received on July 21, 2009, approving the following: (1) use of a three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, (2) a one-year extension to report its three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and (3) to continue using the graduation rate in its current Accountability Workbook as a transitional rate until a three-year adjusted graduation rate in 2011-12 can be reported. Up to 2011-12, PRDE planned to continue to use the transitional graduation rate as described in the approved PRDE Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. This rate is an adaptation of the method recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics.

At the time of Puerto Rico's FFY 2012 APR submission, PRDE was in the process of completing the transition to the three-year adjusted graduation rate for 2011-2012, but the PRDE Planning Unit was still in the process of reviewing and validating data and had not yet reported graduation data using the new rate.

As such, PRDE reported for Indicator 1 using Puerto Rico's approved 3 year cohort graduation rate for the first time with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. For this FFY 2017 APR, PRDE is reporting for Indicator 1 using Puerto Rico's approved 3 year cohort graduation rate for the fifth consecutive year.

The graduation rate only applies to students who received a "regular high school diploma" that is fully aligned with the Puerto Rico academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance or any alternative award. The definition is aligned with the definition of a regular high school diploma under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv). The requirement of PRDE is 24 credits to graduate with a regular high school diploma (Circular letter Number 34-2016-2017). This requirement is the same for students with disabilities.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
 Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			5.80%	23.54%	23.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.75%	21.50%	36.00%	35.50%
Data		29.21%	23.54%	38.60%	32.95%	32.95%	41.59%	43.36%	44.81%	32.56%	34.99%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	35.00%	34.50%
Data	33.92%	32.34%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	34.00%	33.50%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

Option 1

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,880	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	390	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	246	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,888	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	12	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
1,888	7,416	32.34%	34.00%	25.46%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology

Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

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

PRDE defines "drop out" for all youth using the same definition as used for EDFacts reporting requirements. Specifically, these are students who were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before); did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school) or complete a state or district-approved educational program; and did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (1) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program, (2) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or (3) death. The definition is the same for all students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

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

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.93%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%
			Data		98.73%	95.52%	98.59%	98.30%	98.20%	98.73%	98.79%	98.80%	99.04%	98.78%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.64%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%
			Data		98.44%	96.99%	98.43%	98.01%	98.31%	98.81%	98.89%	98.97%	99.23%	98.98%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.73%	98.73%
		Data	98.87%	99.16%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	98.44%	98.44%
		Data	99.06%	99.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.50% 98.73%	98.74% 98.73%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.50% 98.44%	98.45% 98.44%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

In response to OSEP's Response to PRDE's initial FFY 2017 submission, PRDE has made the following changes.

First, as explained in PRDE's discussion of stakeholder input for targets, in meetings with stakeholders over the past year, stakeholders strongly advised that the FFY 2017 target for Indicator 3B be lowered to account for implications related to the impact of Hurricane Maria in September 2017. Specifically, stakeholders raised concerns that the transitory nature of populations on the island as families and individuals responded to immediate needs impacting their livelihood could reasonably impact assessment participation rates for FFY 2017. As such, stakeholders proposed and PRDE agreed with stakeholders that the FFY 2017 target for Indicator 3B for both Reading and Math should be 95%. In light of the continuing return to normalcy following the hurricane, no changes to targets beyond FFY 2018 are being proposed at this time. With this FFY 2017 APR clarification, PRDE updated the Indicator 3B targets for FFY 2017 accordingly.

Second, PRDE updated its FFY 2018 targets as required by OSEP's response so that they reflect improvement over the baseline data.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE has been holding monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of targets, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. In meetings with stakeholders over the past year, stakeholders strongly advised that the FFY 2017 target for Indicator 3B be lowered to account for implications related to the impact of Hurricane Maria in September 2017. Specifically, stakeholders raised concerns that the transitory nature of populations on the island as families and individuals responded to immediate needs impacting their livelihood could reasonably impact assessment participation rates for FFY 2017. As such, stakeholders proposed and PRDE agreed with stakeholders that the FFY 2017 target for Indicator 3B for both Reading and Math should be 95%. In light of the continuing return to normalcy following the hurricane, no changes to targets beyond FFY 2018 are being proposed at this time.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	49,689	48,965	99.16%	98.50%	98.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	49,689	48,850	99.03%	98.50%	98.31%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Public Reporting Information

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

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2017, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: <https://schoolreportcard.azurewebsites.net/reportes/pruebasmeta>. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the GRADS 360 system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments. PRDE notes that its public reporting for FFY 2017 appears in a different format than in prior years. The FFY 2017 statewide assessment results are presented through PRDE's School Report Card website.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State indicated that it revised its targets for FFY 2017 for this indicator; however, the State did not provide updated data in the historical data and targets tables based on the revised target. In addition, OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end target for FFY 2018 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 target to reflect improvement.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

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

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥			27.00%	32.00%	35.00%	24.75%	25.00%	25.50%	25.75%	26.00%	26.50%
			Data			29.86%	39.29%	24.28%	26.81%	29.54%	30.98%	31.72%	30.93%	29.79%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥			35.25%	39.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.75%	21.50%	22.25%	22.75%	23.25%
			Data			37.82%	46.69%	19.30%	22.20%	23.23%	25.31%	24.84%	26.48%	27.30%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	27.00%	27.25%
		Data	35.22%	33.46%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	23.75%	24.00%
		Data	29.65%	28.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	27.50%	27.75%
Math	A ≥ Overall	24.25%	24.50%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAEI held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	48,965	15,354	33.46%	27.50%	31.36%

Status
Met Target
Slippage
No Slippage

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	48,850	14,142	28.91%	24.25%	28.95%

Status
Met Target
Slippage
No Slippage

Public Reporting Information

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

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2017, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: <https://schoolreportcard.azurewebsites.net/reportes/pruebasmeta>. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the GRADS 360 system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments. PRDE notes that its public reporting for FFY 2017 appears in a different format than in prior years. The FFY 2017 statewide assessment results are presented through PRDE's School Report Card website.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.10%
Data		0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.01%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0.10%	0.10%
Data		0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0.10%	0%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0%	0.10%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

PRDE is a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. PRDE is composed of seven educational regions, with four school districts in each educational region (a total of 28 school districts). While PRDE refers to these entities as school districts, they do not constitute LEAs, and this does not impact PRDE's status as a unitary system.

PRDE's status as a unitary system makes applying the actual measurement for Indicator 4a challenging.

On July 10, 2015, OSEP issued a letter to PRDE providing instructions as to the methodologies OSEP would require PRDE, as a unitary system, to use in reporting on Indicator 4A in the FFY 2014 and future SPP/APR submissions. Specifically, OSEP provided PRDE with two methodology options. As reported in the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE selected to employ the second option offered in OSEP's letter: to compare the rates of children with disabilities suspended or expelled among districts, although they are not LEAs as defined under the IDEA.

As such, beginning with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE compares the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 28 school districts (although they are not LEAs) within Puerto Rico.

Under this methodology, PRDE compares district rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability. A district is determined to have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least five percentage points more than the state's average suspension expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the "statewide bar").

The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points. PRDE uses a minimum "n" size requirement to exclude districts from the calculation. Thus, if the district has fewer than 10 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year, that district is not included in the calculation. District rates are calculated by dividing the district's total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the district.

In reviewing all 28 school districts for FFY 2017, PRDE found that none of the 28 districts met the minimum n size for this indicator. As such, no further analysis was required.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

The State did not report valid and reliable data. These data are not valid and reliable because the State checked the radio button indicating that there is no state-established minimum n size; however, the State reported that 28 districts were excluded because they did not meet the state-established minimum "n" size.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Historical Data and Targets

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Puerto Rico has a relatively homogeneous racial and ethnic population, and as such, there is no reasonable method to measure disproportionality (or disproportionate representation) by the Federal racial or ethnic groups or environment. This has been recognized by OSEP, and as such, Indicators B-4B of the IDEA Annual Performance Report does not apply to Puerto Rico. PRDE continues to collect data on race/ethnicity categories as part of the Section 618 data collection; however, PRDE does not employ a current definition of significant disproportionality as it would not provide any meaningful measure.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2012	Target ≥			73.50%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.33%	76.67%
		Data		62.10%	81.00%	81.70%	87.40%	79.30%	80.70%	77.65%	77.84%	77.46%	81.07%
B	2012	Target ≤			14.80%	14.60%	14.40%	14.20%	14.00%	13.80%	13.60%	8.20%	7.70%
		Data		15.00%	10.00%	11.46%	3.30%	9.30%	8.10%	7.63%	5.76%	6.48%	6.01%
C	2012	Target ≤			1.32%	1.32%	1.31%	1.30%	1.29%	1.28%	1.27%	4.00%	3.80%
		Data		0.67%	0.36%	1.08%	1.80%	2.80%	3.20%	3.17%	3.62%	3.10%	2.87%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	77.00%	77.33%
	Data	70.26%	76.27%
B	Target ≤	7.20%	6.70%
	Data	6.94%	8.64%
C	Target ≤	3.60%	3.40%
	Data	2.75%	2.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	77.67%	77.85%
Target B ≤	6.20%	5.70%
Target C ≤	3.20%	3.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAEI held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	93,436	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	67,357	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,611	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,408	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	43	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	628	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	67,357	93,436	76.27%	77.67%	72.09%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,611	93,436	8.64%	6.20%	9.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,079	93,436	2.30%	3.20%	2.23%	Met Target	No Slippage

Reasons for A Slippage

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 5A (the number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day). It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, however, one possible reason may be related to the impact of two significant hurricanes that hit Puerto Rico back-to-back (Hurricanes Irma and María) during September 2017. The devastation caused by these hurricanes, particularly Hurricane María which made landfall on Puerto Rico on September 20, 2017 as a high-end Category 4, nearly Category 5, hurricane was extensive, significantly damaging infrastructure, disabling radar and cell towers, and completely knocking out electricity across the island. Communications within the island were severely impacted. Traditionally, PRDE's child count date has been October 1 of each year. Because of the impact of the hurricanes, Puerto Rico needed to move back its child count date for FFY 2017 to December 1, 2017.

As has been widely reported, Puerto Rico experienced a significant increase in migration off of the island in the weeks and months following these two hurricanes. This resulted in a significant decrease in student population, particularly as of the time of Puerto Rico's child count date (December 1, 2017). Puerto Rico's total child count (ages 3-21) from 2016 to 2017 reflects a decrease of 11%, which was consistent with the decrease in the overall general student population PRDE experienced following the hurricanes. While many families have subsequently returned to Puerto Rico, the hurricanes greatly impacted the student population, particularly as of the time of the FFY 2017 child count.

In considering reasons for slippage with Indicator 5A, it is possible that families with students with disabilities who are able to remain inside the regular class 80% or more of the day may have been more mobile and/or able to be more flexible, and in turn, more readily able to leave Puerto Rico either permanently or for a limited period of time following the hurricanes. Getting off of the island following the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

hurricanes was very challenging initially, both logistically and physically. As such, families with less physical or mobility challenges may have been more likely to be away from Puerto Rico as of the FFY 2017 Child Count date. In turn, this could have resulted in slippage for Indicator 5A, i.e., a decrease in the percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day for FFY 2017.

Reasons for B Slippage

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 5B (the number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day). It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, however, one possible reason may be related to the impact of two significant hurricanes that hit Puerto Rico back-to-back (Hurricanes Irma and María) during September 2017. The devastation caused by these hurricanes, particularly Hurricane María which made landfall on Puerto Rico on September 20, 2017 as a high-end Category 4, nearly Category 5, hurricane was extensive, significantly damaging infrastructure, disabling radar and cell towers, and completely knocking out electricity across the island. Communications within the island were severely impacted. Traditionally, PRDE's child count date has been October 1 of each year. Because of the impact of the hurricanes, Puerto Rico needed to move back its child count date for FFY 2017 to December 1, 2017.

As has been widely reported, Puerto Rico experienced a significant increase in migration off of the island in the weeks and months following these two hurricanes. This resulted in a significant decrease in student population, particularly as of the time of Puerto Rico's child count date (December 1, 2017). Puerto Rico's total child count (ages 3-21) from 2016 to 2017 reflects a decrease of 11%, which was consistent with the decrease in the overall general student population PRDE experienced following the hurricanes. While many families have subsequently returned to Puerto Rico, the hurricanes greatly impacted the student population, particularly as of the time of the FFY 2017 child count

In considering reasons for slippage with Indicator 5B, it is possible that families with students with disabilities who are able to remain inside the regular class less than 40% of the day may have been less mobile and/or less able to be flexible, and in turn, less readily able to leave Puerto Rico either permanently or for a limited period of time following the hurricanes. Getting off of the island following the hurricanes was very challenging initially, both logistically and physically. As such, families with more physical or mobility challenges may have been less likely to be away from Puerto Rico as of the FFY 2017 Child Count date. In turn, this could have resulted in slippage for Indicator 5B, i.e., an increase in the percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day for FFY 2017.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									71.95%	72.00%	72.50%
		Data								71.92%	87.75%	93.88%	73.00%
B	2011	Target ≤									0.75%	0.75%	0.74%
		Data								0.77%	0.41%	0.35%	0.20%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	73.00%	73.50%
	Data	79.35%	78.46%
B	Target ≤	0.73%	0.72%
	Data	0.35%	0.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	74.00%	74.50%
Target B ≤	0.71%	0.70%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	12,391	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	9,815	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	25	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	9,815	12,391	78.46%	74.00%	79.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	25	12,391	0.19%	0.71%	0.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						94.50%	95.00%	95.10%	95.20%	86.00%	86.50%
		Data					94.10%	86.10%	90.50%	87.60%	85.90%	92.31%	88.27%
A2	2008	Target ≥						56.20%	56.50%	56.80%	57.00%	57.20%	57.40%
		Data					56.00%	69.40%	62.52%	60.60%	63.80%	66.73%	58.94%
B1	2008	Target ≥						89.90%	90.10%	90.30%	90.50%	85.80%	86.00%
		Data					89.70%	82.20%	87.97%	88.90%	85.70%	89.48%	85.02%
B2	2008	Target ≥						49.00%	49.20%	49.40%	49.50%	49.50%	49.70%
		Data					48.80%	55.00%	58.14%	58.00%	57.10%	49.59%	53.56%
C1	2008	Target ≥						95.70%	95.90%	96.00%	96.00%	91.00%	91.20%
		Data					95.50%	85.60%	92.99%	90.80%	90.70%	93.72%	90.91%
C2	2008	Target ≥						76.40%	76.70%	77.00%	77.30%	69.50%	69.60%
		Data					72.20%	69.40%	73.37%	71.50%	71.10%	69.79%	67.36%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	87.00%	87.50%
	Data	90.51%	90.93%
A2	Target ≥	57.60%	57.80%
	Data	66.27%	49.55%
B1	Target ≥	86.20%	86.40%
	Data	89.76%	89.29%
B2	Target ≥	49.80%	50.00%
	Data	61.87%	44.28%
C1	Target ≥	91.40%	91.60%
	Data	92.79%	94.10%
C2	Target ≥	69.70%	69.80%
	Data	73.63%	53.61%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	88.00%	94.11%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	58.20%
Target B1 ≥	86.60%	89.71%
Target B2 ≥	50.20%	50.40%
Target C1 ≥	91.80%	95.51%
Target C2 ≥	69.90%	72.21%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators,

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAEF held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5,288
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	175	3.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	690	13.05%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,656	31.32%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,620	49.55%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	147	2.78%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4276.00	5141.00	90.93%	88.00%	83.17%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2767.00	5288.00	49.55%	58.00%	52.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Reasons for A1 Slippage

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-A1. It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE believes the result is improved data quality. Additionally, while the data reflects slippage, PRDE's FFY 2017 data for Indicator 7-A1 (83.17%) remains above (higher than) the FFY 2016 mean across all states for Indicator 7-A1 (81%). In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-A1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE plans to hold discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should in fact be revised.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	200	3.78%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	838	15.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,966	37.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,187	41.36%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	97	1.83%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	4153.00	5191.00	89.29%	86.60%	80.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	2284.00	5288.00	44.28%	50.20%	43.19%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Reasons for B1 Slippage

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-B1. It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE believes the result is improved data quality. Additionally, while the data reflects slippage, PRDE's FFY 2017 data for Indicator 7-B1 (80.00%) remains on par with the FFY 2016 mean across all states for Indicator 7-B1 (81%). In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-B1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE plans to hold discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should in fact be revised.

Reasons for B2 Slippage

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-B2. It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE believes the result is improved data quality. Additionally, PRDE's FFY 2017 data for Indicator 7-B2 (43.19%) remains similar to PRDE's FFY 2016 data for this indicator (44.28%), reflecting slippage from the prior year of just 1.09 percentage points. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-B2 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE plans to hold discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should in fact be revised.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	160	3.03%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	600	11.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,523	28.86%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,804	53.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	191	3.62%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4327.00	5087.00	94.10%	91.80%	85.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2995.00	5278.00	53.61%	69.90%	56.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Reasons for C1 Slippage

The FFY 2017 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-C1. It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE believes the result is improved data quality. Additionally, while the data reflects slippage, PRDE's FFY 2017 data for Indicator 7-C1 (85.06%) remains above (higher than) the FFY 2016 mean across all states for Indicator 7-C1 (80%). In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-C1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE plans to hold discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should in fact be revised.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

The process of data collection begins by completing the *Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar* (a translation of ECO's COSF). When the child exits preschool services, after having received services for at least six months, exit data is gathered using the same document (again, the *Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar*) to determine the child's outcomes in accordance with this indicator's measurement.

SAEE provided each CSEE with the list of students with disabilities who exited the preschool program for the reporting period, from its special education information system database. The CSEEs then validated their lists and gathered the required information with the support of the District and Municipality Special Education Facilitators. These Facilitators visit the schools for the collection of the information that returns to the CSEE to be analyzed and consolidated.

Finally, the CSEEs were responsible for submitting the summary forms for their students to the SAEE Central Level, where the data was tabulated and analyzed by staff in the SAEE Technical Assistance (TA) Unit.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			89.60%	89.60%	89.80%	89.90%	90.00%	89.90%	89.90%	84.70%	85.70%
Data		89.60%	76.00%	83.00%	82.00%	85.00%	82.50%	88.00%	85.00%	88.05%	84.55%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	86.70%	87.70%
Data	81.62%	84.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	88.70%	89.61%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
260	302	84.75%	88.70%	86.09%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	78.85%	383.00
---	--------	--------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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

PRDE includes all students served under Part B in its information system, and, at the time that PRDE selects its sample, all students served under Part B are included. The same process is employed for issuing the survey to parents of all selected students, regardless of whether the student is a preschool student.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

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

A random selection of parents was used for survey administration. As PRDE's special education population for FFY 2017 was 105,827 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2017-2018.

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

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

$$d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)$$

Where:

s = required sample size

X² = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom

at the desired confidence level (3.841)

N = population size

P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this

would provide the maximum sample size)

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

Accordingly, with a universe/population size (N) of 105,827:

$$s = \frac{(3.841) (105,827) (.50) (1-.50)}{(.05)^2 (105,827-1) + (3.841) (.50) (1-.50)}$$

$$= \frac{(406,481.51) (.50) (1-.50)}{(.0025) (105,826) + 1.9205 (.50)}$$

$$= \frac{203,240.75 (.50)}{264.565 + .96025}$$

$$= \frac{101,620.38}{264.565 + .96025}$$

$$= 101,620.38$$

$$= 101,620.38$$

$$= 101,620.38$$

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

265.52525

= 382.71

s = 383 parents

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

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

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

The parents of a total of 383 students with disabilities were selected by the sampling method to receive the inventory. A total of 302 of the 383 parents selected for the sample completed and returned inventories. This constitutes a 78.85% participation rate of the sample group. This survey depends solely on parent responses.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Historical Data and Targets

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Puerto Rico has a relatively homogeneous racial and ethnic population, and as such, there is no reasonable method to measure disproportionality (or disproportionate representation) by the Federal racial or ethnic groups or environment. This has been recognized by OSEP, and as such, Indicators B-9 and B-10 of the IDEA Annual Performance Report do not apply to Puerto Rico. PRDE continues to collect data on race/ethnicity categories as part of the Section 618 data collection; however, PRDE does not employ a current definition of significant disproportionality as it would not provide any meaningful measure.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Puerto Rico has a relatively homogeneous racial and ethnic population, and as such, there is no reasonable method to measure disproportionality (or disproportionate representation) by the Federal racial or ethnic groups or environment. This has been recognized by OSEP, and as such, Indicators B-9 and B-10 of the IDEA Annual Performance Report do not apply to Puerto Rico. PRDE continues to collect data on race/ethnicity categories as part of the Section 618 data collection; however, PRDE does not employ a current definition of significant disproportionality as it would not provide any meaningful measure.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

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

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		70.20%	82.85%	83.01%	82.60%	89.70%	92.02%	89.20%	91.70%	96.58%	96.99%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	95.73%	96.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
9,525	9,206	96.51%	100%	96.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]				319		

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

The following chart reports the ranges of days within which FFY 2017 initial evaluations were held. The chart reflects the total number and percentages of FFY 2017 both within and beyond Puerto Rico's mandated 30 day timeline for completing an initial evaluation. For those 319 evaluations completed beyond the 30 day timeline, the chart reflects the number and percent of evaluations that were completed within several range of day groupings. Notably, 226 of the 319 evaluations at issue were completed within 31 to 60 days. This means that over 99% of FFY 2017 evaluations were completed within the federal timeline of 60 days (9206 + 226 / 9525 = 99.02%).

Region	Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate	Eval. Within 30 days or less	Eval. Within 31-60 days	Eval. Within 61-90 days	Eval. Within 91-120 days	Eval. possibly in more than 120 days
ARECIBO	1286	1251	22	5	2	6
BAYAMON	1477	1409	56	7	2	3
CAGUAS	1256	1237	10	6	2	1
HUMACAO	873	797	52	12	4	8
MAYAGUEZ	1405	1363	33	6	3	0
PONCE	1413	1395	14	3	0	1
SAN JUAN	1815	1754	39	18	1	3
Grand Total	9525	9206	226	57	14	22

As reflected above, PRDE completed 99.02% of FFY 2017 initial evaluations (9432) within 60 days, and 96.65% within Puerto Rico's stricter mandated 30 day timeline. Furthermore, PRDE has verified that 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate in FFY 2017 have received their evaluations.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

PRDE faces a shorter timeline than the Federal requirement (60 days), due to the Rosa Lydia Velez consent decree, which mandates PRDE complete evaluations within a 30 day period.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

PRDE maintains initial evaluation data within its State database, *Mi Portal Especial* (MiPE). CSEE level staff are responsible for entering initial evaluation data into MiPE.

As part of PRDE's efforts to ensure compliance with its State mandated 30 day timeline, PRDE uses an initial evaluation appointment scheduling system to help track initial evaluation appointments and ensure they are scheduled and held timely. This system, which maintains an electronic data bank of available appointments including the date/time by service provider, records appointments made for student evaluations using the student identification number. This allows for proper identification and tracking of appointments made, as well as follow-up for reports on initial evaluations pending from service providers, improving PRDE's controls over ensuring compliance with the 30-day timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	null	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

PRDE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2016, and PRDE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The finding was corrected within one year of identification. In making the correction determination, PRDE verified that (1) the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented and that (2) each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified has been corrected. To verify the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented, PRDE reviewed initial evaluation data for a subsequent period of time and ascertained that children were evaluated in a timely manner, i.e., within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

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

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, PRDE ensured that for each child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, an evaluation was performed, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e. within one year of the identification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		13.17%	30.27%	42.40%	69.00%	53.90%	75.00%	91.20%	77.50%	82.04%	90.78%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	96.03%	96.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,667
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	8
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	974
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	656
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	974	1,003	96.41%	100%	97.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	29
--	----

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

The following table provides the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of these 29 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

# of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2016 and were not determined eligible or provided with services by their third birthday	In place within 30 days following third birthday	In place between 31 and 60 days of third birthday	In place between 61 and 90 days of third birthday	In place between 91 and 120 days of third birthday	In place more than 120 days following third birthday
29	16	3	1	2	7

Reasons for the delays include the following: late referral from the Part C program, data entry errors, new staff, parent failure to keep scheduled appointments, Part C failure to send transition meeting notices in a timely manner, and facilitator failure to attend transition meetings. Half of these 29 cases that were not included in b, d, e, or f were clearly delayed due to the impact of Hurricane Maria—in those cases consent had been obtained in the month leading up to the hurricane and/or the evaluation process was underway and then delayed when the hurricane hit Puerto Rico. The impact of Hurricane Maria made it incredibly challenging and unrealistic to be able to ensure these children were evaluated, and if determined eligible, had their IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. PRDE worked incredibly hard to ensure compliance with Indicator 12 despite the impact of the hurricanes but acknowledges there were some cases that were delayed as a result.

As PRDE improves its maintenance of documentation regarding reasons for delays, and thus is able to more accurately count and reflect cases falling within this category, the resulting data is presenting a more accurate picture of PRDE's compliance with this requirement. PRDE is continuing to work to improve the means by which personnel consistently and timely document this information.

Attached PDF table (optional)

No PDF table was attached

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

PRDE conducted island-wide data collection and several validation activities in order to obtain the number of children who had been served in Part C and referred to Part B, and the number found eligible who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. During FFY 2017, PRDE continued to give follow up to those children identified as potential participants of special education services. Each CSEE has knowledgeable staff that attends to each child from the referral process to the implementation of the IEP. This personnel is also responsible for ensuring data is continuously updated in the system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

PRDE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2016, and PRDE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The finding was corrected within one year of identification. In making the correction determination, PRDE verified that (1) the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented and that (2) each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified has been corrected. To verify the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented, PRDE reviewed data regarding children subsequently referred by Part C prior to age 3 and verified that all of those children received eligibility determinations, and if found eligible for Part B, had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday.

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

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, for each child referred from Part C for which there was noncompliance of the requirements of Indicator 12, PRDE verified that the child (unless no longer within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) was evaluated and received an eligibility determination for Part B, and if found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e. within one year of the identification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						88.90%	95.80%	92.61%	95.50%	94.83%	97.63%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.28%	96.37%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
9,422	9,507	96.37%	100%	99.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

- For FFY 2017, PRDE included the secondary transition checklist as part of the IEP review process for all students age 16 and above within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. The checklist was used for the review of all students age 16 and above as in past years, however, this was the first year during which information was collected through the MiPE system.
- PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B13 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published.
- Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the checklist.
- Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this checklist in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.
- Special Education School Teachers were in charge of reviewing the files and initially completing the transition checklist for this indicator, in coordination with the SAEE Transition Coordinators. SAEE Transition Coordinators were in charge of training staff and monitoring the use of the checklist. Transition Coordinators are also involved in the IEP development and revision process. In total, PRDE reviewed the files of 9,507 students age 16 and above.
- The information for this indicator was requested through MiPE in a timely manner in order to verify the data.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
13	7	6	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) issued a finding of noncompliance with Indicator 13 at thirteen entities during FFY 2016, and PRDE has verified that all thirteen entities have corrected the noncompliance. PRDE was able to verify that seven of the thirteen entities corrected the noncompliance timely, within one year of identification. Hurricane Maria was a significant factor regarding the timeliness of correction in the remaining six entities. The findings at those six entities had been identified and were still within the one year of identification period at the time Hurricane Maria made landfall and crossed Puerto Rico in September 2017. The impact of the hurricane create significant setbacks and challenges across the island, including delaying the time necessary to verify correction of noncompliance. Nonetheless, PRDE was subsequently able to verify the correction of noncompliance at the remaining six entities.

In verifying correction of noncompliance, PRDE's work has been consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In making the correction determination, the MCU verified that each entity (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified.

PRDE verified that each entity with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing data subsequently collected during on-site monitoring. Specifically, for each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed a subsequent selection of at least 5 files selected without advance notice of students age 16 and above and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP Team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

PRDE reviewed each entity with an Indicator 13 finding of noncompliance and verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. For each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed the file of each previously identified finding of noncompliance to verify the correction of each individual case of noncompliance. Specifically, PRDE reviewed those specific files and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

PRDE reported that State monitoring was the source of its FFY 2017 data for this indicator. However, in its narrative, PRDE indicated the information for this indicator was requested through MIPE which is the State's data system.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							48.00%	48.20%	48.40%	48.60%	48.80%
		Data						48.00%	59.40%	44.80%	55.60%	63.24%	62.14%
B	2009	Target ≥							55.30%	55.50%	55.70%	55.80%	55.90%
		Data						55.30%	65.40%	51.00%	56.70%	66.79%	66.37%
C	2009	Target ≥							87.10%	87.30%	87.50%	83.20%	84.00%
		Data						87.10%	83.90%	79.00%	94.60%	86.85%	84.42%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	49.00%	49.20%
	Data	56.32%	57.46%
B	Target ≥	56.00%	56.10%
	Data	60.12%	69.83%
C	Target ≥	84.80%	85.60%
	Data	81.08%	84.58%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	49.40%	49.60%
Target B ≥	56.20%	56.30%
Target C ≥	86.40%	87.11%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3992.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2040.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	573.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	802.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	73.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2040.00	3992.00	57.46%	49.40%	51.10%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2613.00	3992.00	69.83%	56.20%	65.46%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	3488.00	3992.00	84.58%	86.40%	87.37%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? No

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

PRDE did not use sampling. Nonetheless, PRDE analyzed respondent data and determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (target population). The response group accurately reflects the target population. For example, the following chart reflects the make-up of the target population and the response group by disability classification.

IDEA Disability Category Classification	Target Population %	Response Population %
Autism	1.7%	1.9%
Deaf-blindness	0.0%	0.1%
Emotional disturbance	1.9%	1.8%
Hearing impairment	0.6%	0.7%
Mental retardation	8.1%	7.8%
Multiple disabilities	0.7%	0.6%
Orthopedic impairment	0.3%	0.3%
Other health impairment	13.4%	13.9%
Specific learning disability	65.1%	65.8%
Speech or language impairment	7.6%	6.6%
Traumatic brain injury	0.0%	0.0%
Visual impairment	0.5%	0.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%

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

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				50.30%	50.70%	51.00%	51.50%	51.75%	52.00%	52.25%	52.50%
Data			50.00%	60.13%	52.70%	61.97%	61.48%	55.92%	44.81%	52.71%	65.44%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	52.75%	53.00%
Data	62.38%	59.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	53.25%	53.50%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	216	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	305	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
216	305	59.00%	53.25%	70.82%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			61.00%	62.50%	63.50%	64.50%	65.00%	65.25%	65.50%	65.75%	66.00%
Data		43.30%	57.90%	69.97%	75.10%	73.97%	93.19%	75.77%	78.20%	87.89%	95.73%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	66.25%	66.50%
Data	94.09%	91.61%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	66.75%	67.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE developed this FFY 2017 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. PRDE is doing monthly meetings with the stakeholder group as an effort to include their suggestions and comments during the development of this APR and received their input regarding all indicators, targets, and related activities. The themes discussed during these meetings included the FFY 2016 APR determination letter results. All the input received was considered for the development of this FFY 2017 SPP/APR. With regard to the initial establishment of existing targets, PRDE SAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group in establishing the targets in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	204	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	233	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
204	5	233	91.61%	66.75%	89.70%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		1.50%	1.50%	2.50%	3.00%
Data	1.47%				

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	3.50%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Description of Measure

Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools scoring at or above proficient against grade level) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools who received a valid score on the PPAA and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and calculated for math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets were discussed during stakeholder meetings. Initially, stakeholders suggested setting targets identical to the Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs) established in PRDE's approved ESEA Flexibility Plan. The established AMOs are much more general, including the scores on all assessments island-wide from third through eighth grades. The data analysis, discussed below, reflected that the percentage of students reaching proficiency on the assessments for those grades clearly decreased each year, such that the percentage of students attaining proficiency on the third grade assessment was higher than those attaining proficiency on the fourth grade assessment, etc. As demonstrated by the baseline data for the schools at issue (1.47%), using the AMOs for this specific group would be unrealistic and fail to meaningfully consider the actual baseline for this specific population. As such, targets have been set that consider the actual baseline and an ambitious yet realistic goal for which to aim for each year. Additionally, because interventions will have been in place for such a short period before the 2014-2015 assessment, and 2015-2016 will be the first school year in which the interventions will be in place the full year, the decision was to maintain the baseline for the first two years.

Thanks to the collaboration with Academic Affairs, communication with the District Special Assistant of Yabucoa has been excellent. She has been engaged in the implementation of the SSIP in her District and has served as the liaison between the school directors for the schools that have been selected to participate in the SSIP initiative.

Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in every phase of the SSIP. Please note that stakeholder input is discussed throughout the SSIP, not solely in this section.

Overview

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

The Associated Secretariat of Special Education (SAEE by its initials in Spanish) of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE), with the collaborative support of the United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs, as part of the Results Driven Accountability efforts presents its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with the purpose of improving child-level outcomes for students with disabilities. The SSIP is the new Indicator 17 for the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Improvement Act (IDEA) State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR).

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	1.47%

FFY 2014-FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	1.5%	1.5%	2.5%	3.0%	3.5%

Description of Measure

Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools scoring at or above proficient against grade level) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools who received a valid score on the PPAA and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and calculated for math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholders Input

Targets were discussed during stakeholder meetings. Initially, stakeholders suggested setting targets identical to the Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs) established in PRDE's approved ESEA Flexibility Plan. The established AMOs are much more general, including the scores on all assessments island-wide from third through eighth grades. The data analysis, discussed below, reflected that the percentage of students reaching proficiency on the assessments for those grades clearly decreased each year, such that the percentage of students attaining proficiency on the third grade assessment was higher than those attaining proficiency on the fourth grade assessment, etc. As demonstrated by the baseline data for the schools at issue (1.47%), using the AMOs for this specific group would be unrealistic and fail to meaningfully consider the actual baseline for this specific population. As such, targets have been set that consider the actual baseline and an ambitious yet realistic goal for which to aim for each year. Additionally, because interventions will have been in place for such a short period before the 2014-2015 assessment, and 2015-2016 will be the first school year in which the interventions will be in place the full year, the decision was to maintain the baseline for the first two years.

Thanks to the collaboration with Academic Affairs, communication with the District Special Assistant of Yabucoa has been excellent. She has been engaged in the implementation of the SSIP in her District and has served as the liaison between the school directors for the schools that have been selected to participate in the SSIP initiative.

Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in every phase of the SSIP. Please note that stakeholder input is discussed throughout the SSIP, not solely in this section.

Data Analysis

The SAEE selected a group of stakeholders to work with in developing its SSIP, including from the initial stages of data analysis. The stakeholder group is composed of representatives from an array of sectors including: Special Education Service Center (CSEE by its acronym in Spanish) Executive Directors, parents of students with disabilities, Special Assistants/Compliance Officers, ESEA Flexibility Plan Coordinator, and relevant consultants. This group was selected to be able to conduct a comprehensive and effective analysis of the data. Once the group was selected, an orientation was held that included an explanation of the SSIP initiative and the need for the beginning of the process to include important data analysis.

Next we discuss the initial data analysis that led to the selection of the area of focus for improvement for our SSIP.

Identification of the Focus for Improvement

For the identification of focus for improvement the stakeholder group for SSIP met in various sessions. During the first session the stakeholder group narrowed the themes to Early Intervention and Assessment.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Data Analysis for Early Intervention (Indicator 7)

In an initial stakeholder group meeting, the group expressed great interest in focusing the SSIP on impacting Indicator 7, early childhood outcomes, with the purpose of improving the process for completing the Summary of Results of Pre-School Intervention form across the island. The group reviewed Indicator 7 data from Puerto Rico’s APRs for FFYs 2008-2012. Tables 1-3, below, include the Indicator 7 data that was reviewed.

Table 1-Analysis by Year for Indicator 7, Outcome A

Table 2-Analysis by Year for Indicator 7, Outcome B

Table 3-Analysis by Year for Indicator 7, Outcome C

As reflected in the data in Tables 1-3 above, PRDE maintained averages of over 85% for the percentage of students who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program for all three outcomes (A, B, and C). Additionally, for outcomes A and B, PRDE demonstrated significant improvement from FFY 2008 to FFY 2012 in terms of the percent of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited the program. For outcome C, this figure remained relatively steady over time at around 70%.

As previously mentioned, the stakeholder group’s initial interest in focusing the SSIP on Indicator 7 was to focus on improving the process for completing the Summary of Results of Pre-School Intervention from across the island—not because the above reviewed data indicated a significant need for intervention on improving results.

During a technical assistance visit by OSEP to PRDE SAEE in May 2014, OSEP raised a concern of such a focus being more process-oriented and not sufficiently addressing child-outcomes to meet the purposes of the SSIP. As a result, a new meeting was held with the stakeholder group to re-consider the focus topic for the SSIP.

In that meeting, the group was in agreement on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it has perhaps the greatest correlation to measuring academic achievement of our students. This indicator is also related to the Puerto Rico Department of Education’s ESEA Flexibility Plan.

Data Analysis for Assessment (Indicator 3 proficiency)

The first step was to evaluate the historical data reported in Puerto Rico from FFY 2008 through FFY 2012. During this analysis, stakeholders reviewed the performance of students with disabilities on Puerto Rico’s annual assessments in both Math and Spanish to identify the area of greatest need. This analysis was extensive and included reviews of student performance on both the regular and alternate assessment, performance by grade level, and performance by geographical region. Next we provide a series of tables of data that was reviewed, along with descriptions of the data analysis and observations.

Table 4-Analysis by Year of the Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on the Annual Assessments (Indicator 3C)

Examination	FFY 2008	FFY 2009	FFY 2010	FFY 2011	FFY 2012
Spanish Proficiency	24.27%	26.81%	29.62%	25.31%	31.73%
Math Proficiency	19.30%	22.20%	23.23%	30.98%	24.84%

The data in Table 4 reflects PRDE’s data under APR Indicator 3C from FFY 2008 through FFY 2012. The proficiency rate reflects the percentage of students with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned who scored at or above proficient (i.e., receiving a score of ‘proficient’ or ‘advanced’). This proficiency rate includes students who took both the regular and alternate assessments and is calculated separately for reading (Spanish) and math.

This data reflects that in nearly all years a lower percentage of students with disabilities attained proficiency on the Math examination than on the Spanish examination. The one exception was FFY 2011. Aside from FFY 2011, the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in Math for FFY 2008-FFY 2012 never reached 25%. In light of this data, and the agency-wide concern with the mathematics proficiency rate for all students, the stakeholder group decided to focus on student performance on the mathematics assessment.

Next, stakeholders analyzed and compared proficiency rates in Mathematics for students taking the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Table 5-Analysis by Year of Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on the Alternate and Regular Assessments in Mathematics

Year	Alternate Assessment		%	Regular Assessment		%
	# of children with IEPs in AA against AAS	# of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient		# of children with IEPs in RA	# of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the RA	

The data in Table 5 reflects a consistent pattern in which a lower percentage of students attained proficiency on the regular assessment than on the alternate assessment. FFY 2008 is the one exception, but it is important to note that the FFY 2008 proficiency rate was the lowest of all years reviewed for students taking both assessments.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		or above as measured by the AA against AAS						
				W/Accom.	W/ No Accom.	W/Accom.	W/ No Accom.	
FFY 2008	2057	396	19%	42820	12107	8451	2376	20%
FFY 2009	2191	554	25%	45685	10888	10501	2217	22%
FFY 2010	2223	673	30%	48853	8590	11529	1827	23%
FFY 2011	2266	649	29%	47537	7761	12115	1969	25%
FFY 2012	2094	711	34%	51345	7805	12684	1975	25%

Additionally, the difference in the proficiency rates that year was only 1% (proficiency rates of 19% vs. 20%). The data for both assessments demonstrates improvement in proficiency rates from FFY 2008 to FFY 2012 but not at the rate PRDE SAAE would like to see improvement.

In light of this data analysis, as well as the facts that the far majority of students with disabilities take the regular assessment and the concurrent agency wide initiatives, especially those related to PRDE’s ESEA Flexibility Plan (see infrastructure analysis discussion), the decision was made to

focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment.

Having analyzed the above discussed APR data related to Indicator 3C, the group turned to analyzing data from the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). The group had looked at CSPR data previously, but having narrowed the focus to the proficiency of rates of students with disabilities in mathematics against grade level standards, the group re-visited the data to take a look at gaps in the proficiency rate between students with disabilities versus all students, by grade level.

Table 6-Comparison of Proficiency Rates on the Mathematics Examination of All Students vs. Students with Disabilities, by Grade Level (2012-2013)

MATHEMATICS	Proficiency Rate (Percent of Students Scoring at ‘Proficient’ or ‘Advanced’)			
	All Students	%	Students with Disabilities	%
Third (3rd) Grade	21700	66.51%	5695	59.94%
Fourth (4th) Grade	17256	53.26%	4199	44.07%
Fifth (5th) Grade	13515	40.68%	2936	31.44%
Sixth (6th) Grade	5791	16.52%	1106	11.85%
Seventh (7th) Grade	3367	8.84%	641	6.43%
Eighth (8th) Grade	3712	10.29%	566	6.57%
High School	2749	9.45%	232	4.65%

Analyzing the Mathematics exam results it was determined that, specifically, sixth grade demonstrated very low level of performance and would be the focus for PRDE’s SSIP. The decision to focus on sixth grade included more factors than simply the achievement gaps between students with disabilities and all students. While the gaps may not be the largest in sixth grade, the overall proficiency rates for students with disabilities was the lowest of all elementary school grade levels. Stakeholders discussed a desire to focus improvement activities in the later elementary grades, specifically grades four through six, with hopes of impacting sixth grade mathematics proficiency rate results. In improving sixth grade mathematics proficiency rate results, students should be better positioned for exiting elementary school.

In addition to having reviewed proficiency rates data by assessment subject, assessment type, and assessed grade level, the SAAE reviewed more detailed raw data that allowed stakeholders to analyze proficiency rate data at the regional and district levels. PRDE obtained this more detailed data upon request from the PRDE Planning Unit. The Planning Unit provided the database of student performance results on Puerto Rico’s regular annual academic assessment examinations (i.e., against grade level standards), the *Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico* (PPAA) for school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

The data analyzed for both years was broken down by grade and provided at the region, district and school levels. The assessment results data details student performance level in each exam as falling within one of four categories: Pre-Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced. As a result of this analysis, it was determined that the focus of this initiative should be focused on the geographical area in which students presented the lowest level of academic achievement.

Table 7-Comparison of Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on the Mathematics PPAA by Region

Region	2013	2014	Comparison
	% P/A	% P/A	
Arecibo	26.23%	25.94%	-0.30%
Bayamón	22.35%	22.98%	0.63%
Caguas	29.83%	31.79%	1.97%
Humacao	19.48%	21.32%	1.83%
Mayagüez	26.00%	27.56%	1.56%
Ponce	25.62%	27.49%	1.87%
San Juan	20.88%	22.43%	1.55%
Grand Total	24.50%	25.78%	1.29%

Table 7 reflects the proficiency rates (i.e., percentage scoring at ‘proficient’ or ‘advanced’) of students with disabilities on the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Mathematics PPAA administered in April 2013 (2012-2013) and April 2014 (2013-2014). Additionally, the table includes the raw change in percentage in each region’s proficiency rate from the April 2013 to the April 2014 PPAA administrations.

The data reflects that the lowest proficiency rates for both years was Humacao Region. This is despite the Humacao Region having one of the larger improvements in proficiency rate data from the 2013 administration to the 2014 administration. As a result of this analysis, the decision was made to focus initial SSIP efforts in the Humacao Region.

Having selected to focus on the Humacao Region, additional factors upon proficiency rates, such a gender and disability determination, were reviewed.

Table 8-Comparison by Gender of the Performance of Students with Disabilities on the Mathematics PPAA within the Humacao Region (All Grade Levels)

Performance Level	Female		Male	
	2013	2014	2013	2014
Pre-Basic/ Basic	81%	79%	80%	79%
Proficient/Advanced	19%	21%	20%	21%

The Table 8 data reflects that there was nearly no difference based on gender in the proficiency rates of students with disabilities on the Mathematics PPAA in the Humacao Region. In fact, the proficiency rates by gender for the 2014 administration were identical. The raw difference in proficiency rates for the 2013 administration was only 1%.

The regional proficiency rate data was also broken down by disability and reviewed, but it was determined to not focus the SSIP on any specific disability groups. While there was some variation in proficiency rate by disability, stakeholders determined the SSIP effort should aim to impact all students with disabilities in the general classroom setting, regardless of disability. Due to the small size of some of the disability groups in this analysis, it was determined that the data table would not be included in the SSIP some group sizes were not statistically significant and might be seen as disclosing personal information. Again, the stakeholders were clear with the desire to provide the interventions to all students with disabilities in the general classroom setting regardless of type of disability.

Next, the data was reviewed at the district level within the Humacao Region. The next table reflects the mathematics proficiency rates for students with disabilities taking the PPAA, by district, within the Humacao Region.

Table 9-Comparison of Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on the Mathematics PPAA by District within the Humacao Region (All Grade Levels)

Humacao Region Districts	2013	2014	Comparison
	% P/A	% P/A	
Canovanas	18.73%	20.41%	1.68%
Fajardo	22.71%	20.94%	-1.77%
Las Piedras	22.73%	25.68%	2.95%
Yabucoa	14.43%	16.82%	2.39%
Humacao Region	19.48%	21.32%	1.83%

Analyzing the Mathematics exam results for this region by district, it was determined that Yabucoa District demonstrated the lowest percentage of students with disabilities attaining proficiency on the mathematics PPAA and would be the initial focus for PRDE’s SSIP. Although the Yabucoa District had the second highest raw percentage improvements in this data from 2013 to 2014, it had a significantly lower percentage of students with disabilities attaining proficiency than the other districts.

Table 10-Comparison by Grade of Performance of Students with Disabilities within the Yabucoa District on the Mathematics PPAA

Grade Level	% Pre-Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced
Third (3rd Grade)	13.2%	41.4%	21.5%	23.8%
Fourth (4th) Grade	22.0%	49.1%	14.5%	14.4%
Fifth (5th) Grade	32.5%	51.6%	12.6%	3.3%
Sixth (6th) Grade	51.4%	45.3%	2.7%	0.7%
Seventh (7th) Grade	42.0%	56.2%	1.1%	0.7%
Eighth (8th) Grade	50.3%	48.0%	0.6%	1.1%
Eleventh (11th Grade)	49.3%	50.3%	0.4%	0.0%
Grand Total	35.7%	48.7%	8.4%	7.2%

As a result of the data analysis conducted, it was recommended that the SSIP would begin with a focus on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities taking the PPAA in mathematics within the Yabucoa district. For reasons discussed further within this SSIP, including the infrastructure analysis, the determination was later made to further focus the SSIP on those students attending schools within the Yabucoa district designated as ‘focus schools’ through PRDE’s ESEA Flexibility Plan.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the longer the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention build up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP.

For the start of Phase II of the SSIP, the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the selected topic. The additional resources incorporated into the stakeholder group were: Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa School District (who is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Flexibility Plan in the District of Yabucoa), PRDE Director of the Mathematics Program, a School Director, and a Special Education Teacher. The school director and special education teacher were selected from outside of the Yabucoa district, with the purpose of providing classroom and school director level perspectives without the influence of being individuals who would be directly involved with the initial SSIP efforts. The selected school director came from a school designated a school of excellence under the ESEA Flexibility Plan. The special education teacher was selected in part due to her being a specialist with mathematics instruction and assessment.

The new members received an orientation regarding the SSIP at the next meeting. During that meeting, the stakeholders discussed the elementary schools in the district and which schools might be included in implementation of the SSIP. PRDE SAE determined that all elementary schools in the Yabucoa School District that were designated as 'Focus Schools' in accordance with PRDE's ESEA flexibility plan would be included. The nine schools are listed below, along with the municipality in which each is located in parenthesis:

- Calzada (Maunabo)
- Marín Abajo (Patillas)
- Eugenio María de Hostos (San Lorenzo)
- Luis Muñoz Rivera (San Lorenzo)
- Gerardo Selles Sola (San Lorenzo)
- Quemados (San Lorenzo)
- Quebrada Honda/SU Isidro Vicens (San Lorenzo)
- Dra. María T. Delgado de Marcano (San Lorenzo)
- Jorge Rosario del Valle (San Lorenzo)

With the purpose of measuring academic progress of students in these schools throughout the school year, it was determined that additional data could be requested and analyzed. As such, the SAE will be requesting from the Yabucoa District data results from the district's analysis of evaluations of student academic progress. This district level analysis is conducted by subgroup and is conducted based on ten week periods (following the first 10, 20, 30, and 40 weeks of the school year). This will provide academic data aside from the annual assessment which can be reviewed to consider the impact of SSIP interventions throughout the year. Additionally, on a quarterly basis, the SAE will request from the Undersecretary for Academic Affairs the results of desk monitoring conducted at the focus school to validate the effectiveness of Flexibility Plan interventions being carried out in the schools.

Root causes contributing to low performance

As part of the work plan, initial visits to three of the selected schools were held with the goal of providing the schools an orientation regarding the SSIP. Moreover, conversations were held with each of the school directors to identify some of the possible causes for the low achievement levels. Among the possible general causes identified were:

- Lack of a Special Education Facilitator in the municipalities and the district.
- Need for professional development for general education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities.
- Need to strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers.
- Lack of communication between the teacher from the general education classroom and the special education teacher.
- Lack of schools utilizing data based strategies in making educational decisions.

Throughout this data analysis process, stakeholders analyzed the data closely with an eye for identifying data quality concerns. However, no data quality concerns were identified. Additionally, compliance data was considered, and no potential barriers to improvement were considered as a result of this analysis. For example, assessment participation rates and initial evaluation data were considered, but these raised no concerns as to the impact on the validity of the proficiency rate data.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

The Puerto Rico Department of Education, as part of this ESEA Flexibility Plan application process, conducted an analysis of existing infrastructure with the goal of assuring an accurate accounting of areas and resources that would allow it to comply with the terms of its ESEA Flexibility Plan. It is important to note that as a part of the work undertaken with the stakeholder group during Phase I of the SSIP, the stakeholders reviewed the infrastructure analysis previously conducted by the PRDE through the ESEA Flexibility efforts. The stakeholders validated that this recently conducted infrastructure analysis was very helpful and responsive to the interest of development of the SSIP. Herein, we provide a description of PRDE infrastructure and explain how this infrastructure analysis responds to not only the needs of the ESEA Flexibility Plan but also to the SSIP initiative.

PRDE operates a unitary system with a central level lead by the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education and two principal subsecretaries: one focused on academic affairs, and the second focused on administrative affairs. The central level office leadership also includes a Special Education Secretary who oversees the SAEE and an Auxiliary Secretary for Planning and Educational Development. The Auxiliary Secretary for Planning is responsible for collection of PRDE data, the analysis and validation of data, and sharing the data with other PRDE offices. The Special Education Secretary is in charge of all matters related to the administration of the special education program, including, technical assistance, transition, transportation, equitable services, provision of services to students with disabilities, and compliance with requirements related to special education. It is important to note that over 80% of students with disabilities within the PRDE system receive their education in the general curriculum, in a general education classroom setting. The PRDE Sub-Secretary for Academic Affairs has appointed a liaison to work directly with and in close coordination with the SAEE.

PRDE divides the island geographically into seven educational regions, which are now called (ORE by its acronym in Spanish) Regional Educational Offices which are the only the division thru the island the 28 school districts were eliminated and all personell now responds directly to the ORE.

The 7, Regional Education Offices, educational regions are functional units of the PRDE, under the supervision/leadership of a Regional Director. The regions are charged with administrative responsibilities for the purpose of benefiting school districts and schools falling within their geographical boundaries. Regional Directors are responsible for a variety of activities such as organizing training programs for school administrative personnel; coordinating transportation services; organizing academic, recreational, and cultural activities for schools; and managing professional services for students with disabilities. Regions are also responsible for providing support to address administrative issues in different schools and providing recommendations for addressing such problems. In addition, regions support schools on discipline norms; maintain teacher certification records; provide orientation to school directors on services and systems related to school security as well as any other administrative function delegated by the Secretary of Education.

The districts are branches of PRDE that operate under the direction of a district level special assistant who supervises all academic activities of the schools within the geographical boundaries of the given region. As part of the district structure, the district level staffing includes academic facilitators for core academic subjects (Spanish, Mathematics, English, etc.) who function as instructional leaders for teachers, serve as coaches, and facilitate professional development regarding curriculum and instructional strategies. These facilitators also provide support in the design of programs adjusted to address the needs of specific students in the school and they collaborate with School Directors in the development of programs for a variety of student subgroups such as the gifted, low performing students, students at-risk of dropping out of school, students enrolled in special education, and students with limited Spanish proficiency. The districts are also responsible for the coordination of professional development activities for teachers and other school support personnel.

At the school level, each school has a School Director (the equivalent of a school principal) who is in charge of the administrative responsibilities and functions as a teaching leader for all teachers within the school. It is important to note that each school director, in conjunction with their school's PCEA Working Committee, will, among other things, establish the activities and interventions that the school will be developing during the school year in order to increase/improve the academic achievement of its students. This plan is known as the Authentic Comprehensive School Plan (PCEA by its acronym in Spanish). The PCEA permits each school to:

- Document achievements of students, personnel, and other resources available for the year, utilizing the available data provided by the PRDE planning unit.
- Document the analysis of student achievement tendencies, identify root causes of low academic achievement, y propose strategies for improving student academic achievement.
- Summarize school professional development needs pin down additional professional development needs to meet the needs of specific student subgroups within the school.
- Plan activities that reflect the interests and needs of parents, plan initiatives to involve parents in educational processes of the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

school and promote strong and effective relationships between families and the school.

- Plan for effective use of school budget during the current school year.

PRDE uses a standard platform for PCEAs, which assists and guides schools with the development of their PCEAs. This and other technological tools makes it possible to standardize analysis of needs and the planning process for interventions, retrieval of school level data, dissemination of data to the schools, and use of data for decision making at the school, district, and central levels.

At the PRDE SAEI central level, SAEI is made up of Technical Assistance and Academic Support Unit which consists of seven (7) Special Education Academic Facilitators. This unit also responds to the needs of and provides assistance to the eleven (11) Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs by its acronym in Spanish). Generally speaking, this unit has the following responsibilities:

- Establish SAEI Public Policy in the Academic Area
- Work with the following topics: serving deaf, blind, and deaf-blind students; placement alternatives; early childhood transition; post-secondary transition; autism; and, adaptive physical education.
- Coordinate, via the district-level Special Education Academic Facilitators, activities related to academic support and Technical assistance to schools.
- Prepare and execute a Professional Development Plan for district, municipal, and CSEE level Special Education Academic Facilitators.
- Assure that interventions that should be carried out in the schools in compliance with the ESEA Flexibility Plan are realized.
- Through the CSEEs, streamline and provide special Education services from child find/identification through placement of students.

Previously, the facilitators from the Technical Assistance Unit were assigned to substantive specialty areas (e.g., serving deaf-blind students, transition). However, as part of the analysis carried out by the Special Education Secretary in searching for improved academic support to the regions, districts, CSEEs, and schools, it was determined to assign each facilitator from this unit by Educational Region rather than substantive specialty area. Through this change in approach, the SAEI assured the maintenance of constant and consistent communication with the various administrative levels that make up the PRDE. Moreover, this assures the Technical assistance needs of both districts and schools are met.

As for data systems, the SAEI maintains and can access information regarding students with disabilities from two database/student Information systems which are able to communicate with each other: (i) *Mi Portal Especial* ('My Special Portal' or 'MiPE') (the special Education specific student information system) and (ii) the *Sistema de Información Estudiantil* (the 'Student Information System' or 'SIE' by its acronym in Spanish). Both systems identify students using the same student identification number. This is an improvement compared to the prior special education specific student information system which did not allow for the same level of integration between the two systems.

The following diagram lays out the PRDE infrastructure/organizational structure relevant to implementation of the ESEA Flexibility Plan and the SSIP. It reflects the relationship between the different agency components.

Figure 1-Organizational Chart

Combining Resources and Efforts to Achieve Similar Goals: A Strength of the Puerto Rico SSIP is its Implementation Alongside and Integration with PRDE's ESEA Flexibility Plan Efforts

One of the criteria taken into consideration for the selection of Indicator 3 as the focus for the SSIP is the fact that this is also a focus of PRDE's ESEA Flexibility Plan, which has an end goal of improving academic achievement for students, with a goal of having both initiatives aligned and working together. The shared connection in focus and commitment of resources and initiatives is an added strength for the SSIP.

As part of Principle II of the ESEA Flexibility Plan, Puerto Rico proposed a differentiated model of accountability. This new system allows for enhanced transparency, presents new and ambitious Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), and classifies schools into four categories: priority, focus, excellence, and transition (remaining Title I schools not otherwise classified). As established through the Flexibility Plan, the initiative provides external service providers to the lowest performing schools (which are designated as 'priority schools') and the schools with the lowest graduation rates or largest educational gaps (designated as 'focus schools'). This permits PRDE to attend to the specific needs of these schools utilizing comprehensive research based interventions.

As established in PRDE's ESEA Flexibility plan, during the 2013-2014 school year, each school district is to focus its efforts in providing technical assistance to support teachers with their professional development, maintaining rigor in education based in high standards and expectations. As previously mentioned, the district-level academic facilitators have a key responsibility of monitoring the planning and implementation of school interventions. As such, they are responsible for assuring that schools are attending adequately to these needs with interventions designed to improve the teaching-learning process for all. As part of the Flexibility Plan, teachers serving students with disabilities are provided technical assistance and supervision via the Special Education Academic Facilitators. This personnel is available for all schools and can provide coaching activities within the school as a form of on-site professional development. The hope is that such technical assistance will improve professional capacity of teachers to provide differentiated instruction and make the curriculum more accessible to students with disabilities.

Each school district is to prepare technical assistance calendars to attend to teachers and directors in their efforts to obtain an increase in the academic achievement of our students. The PRDE hopes to evidence a significant growth in academic achievement and to identify valid strategies to maintain academic progress for the 2015-2016 school year.

As part of PRDE's efforts to strengthen infrastructure with the goal of fully implementing the Flexibility Plan, external resources are

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

assigned to provide services to each school classified as a priority or focus school. These resources, external service providers, are referred to as the *Red de Apoyo Diferenciado* (Differentiated Support Network, 'RAD' by its acronym in Spanish). The RADs offer administrative and academic support individualized to address the specific areas of need for each school. The RADs also help schools in planning and implementation of the interventions designed to result in school transformation. Each school community, in cooperation with its assigned external service provider (i.e., its RAD), works to achieve the goals established in the school's intervention plan (which is a component of the school's PCEA). This intervention plan is to contain and address the school's needs and the specific reasons for why they school has been identified as priority or focus.

One of the services the RADs provide is professional development (via workshops, coaching, and other means) throughout the school year and push for the creation of a culture of data based decision making. Moreover, the RADs have the responsibility to provide the necessary support for schools to extended learning time and strengthen community integration. The services provided by the RADs are provided consistent with the strategies established by the School Director in the school's PCEA. Nonetheless, RAD services and resources are provided under a separate budget wholly apart from the school's standard operating budget. For implementing the RAD service efforts, PRDE has assigned a budget of approximately \$81 million dollars island-wide for contracting the external service providers.

With the purpose of assuring compliance [compliance with what? Flex Plan?], PRDE has developed internal systems for monitoring focus schools, through the districts, with the goal of assuring the schools are receiving the necessary support to comply with student needs and attend to the root causes of student academic performance issues. As established through the Flexibility Plan, these monitoring activities are to be held at least three times per year and may include desk monitoring or school visits. As part of the monitoring visits, focus are to provide quarterly evidence of implementation of their action plan. This evidence is collected through the desk monitoring process to be carried out by the Subsecretary for Academic Affairs. It's important to note that the information about results of this monitoring activity will be shared with the SAEF to guide decision making y develop new strategies or interventions, as necessary.

To demonstrate appropriate implementation and provide follow-up to the planned interventions with priority and focus schools, PRDE will use an external evaluator. The external evaluator will be responsible for monitoring the processes associated with planning, implementation, and intervention results with the priority and focus schools. Moreover, the external evaluator will carry out follow-up activities directly to the schools via on-site visits at least once per year.

PRDE considers that its strategies with focus schools will result in all students meeting rigorous standards and that all schools will attend to student needs, especially subgroups with lower demonstrated levels of achievement such as students with disabilities and limited Spanish proficient students. Because of the link between the ESEA Flexibility Plan and the interventions making up the SSIP, the involved costs for implementing the interventions have already been contemplated and reserved for these specific purposes. One resource for the SSIP not contemplated by the ESEA Flexibility Plan involves the more intensive involvement from the SAEF central level holding visits to the selected schools, assisting more directly in the needs assessment process and the professional development offerings.

One limitation has been the amount of subject/material based academic facilitators and special education academic facilitator positions that were vacant. Academic Facilitators are area or subject experts who serve as liaisons between the administrative levels to support services within their area of expertise in the schools. At the district-level, there are Academic Facilitators dedicated to subject-matter areas such as Mathematics as well as Academic Facilitators with expertise in Special Education. Additionally, there are Special Education Academic Facilitators assigned to the municipality level. With the goal of providing the best academic support to the schools, the SAEF revised the job responsibilities of the Special Education Facilitators at the District and Municipality levels to clarify their distinct roles and responsibilities. For special education, the municipality facilitators focus on gathering data and documentation evidencing compliance with legal requirements and reporting while the district level facilitators are dedicated to providing technical assistance on more academic and results oriented matters, including integrating themselves with the district work plan.

At the outset of Phase I of the SSIP, the majority of Special Education Academic Facilitator positions within the Humacao Region were vacant—at both the district and municipality levels. Specific to the Yabucoa District, the district had been without any assigned Special Education Academic Facilitators for an extended period of time. As a result, the region struggled with the its limited number of Special Education Facilitators focusing in large part on attending to administrative and reporting tasks, not allowing sufficient time for providing the academic support and technical assistance required by the schools.

Such vacant positions were a concern island-wide, but particularly within the Humacao Region. Following a significant effort by PRDE and SAEF, pushed in part by the Flexibility and SSIP efforts, there has been success in filling the majority of Special Education Academic Facilitator positions that were empty island-wide. In the case of special education facilitator positions, the SAEF has successfully filled more than 75% of the positions that were vacant. Within Humacao Region, and as part of ensuring the necessary infrastructure to implement the SSIP, the SAEF filled 100% of the Special Education Academic Facilitator positions. Through this effort, there was success in strengthening the academic component that is providing technical assistance directly to the schools as well as at the district and SAEF levels.

In terms of Mathematics at the outset of Phase I, the district only had one Mathematics Facilitator for providing technical assistance to the district. An analysis conducted as a part of the ESEA Flexibility Plan infrastructure analysis, it was determined that the Humacao Region required three mathematics facilitators. Since that time, all three mathematics facilitator positions were created and have been filled. These efforts to ensure the necessary infrastructure in terms of Special Education and Mathematics Facilitators with the Humacao Region is key to successful implementation of PRDE's SSIP.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Considering the infrastructure analysis as part of SSIP Phase I, it was determined that as part of Phase II of the SSIP, PRDE would include as part of the stakeholder group, representation of the different levels of the DEPR. The additional resources incorporated into the stakeholder group, which has been mentioned previously in the SSIP, included the Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa School District (whose main responsibility is overseeing the implementation of the Flexibility Plan in the District of Yabucoa), the Director of the Mathematics Program (which is part of the Undersecretary of Academic Affairs), a School Director, and a Special Education Teacher. In addition, as part of the stakeholder group, the SAEE joined forces with the Yabucoa School District with the goal of carrying out coordinated work to address both Flexibility and the SSIP initiatives. Initially, orientations were held to present the SSIP and evaluate how special education would be able to strengthen support provided by the RAD. Working sessions were coordinated to analyze the planned interventions in the selected schools, along with employees of the school district and the RADs.

Below we provide a graphic image of the representatives who were involved in the development of Phase I and will be involved in the development and implementation of Phase II of the SSIP:

Figure 2-Representatives who are involve in the development of SSIP

In the *Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies* section, more detail is provided regarding the strategies to be implemented.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Statement

PRDE's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is aligned to APR Indicator 3C and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the PPAA. Specifically, the SIMR shall be an increase in the percentage % of special education students from the 6th grade who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools in the Yabucoa School District.

As stated at the outset of this SSIP, the following tables reflect the SIMR baseline data (FFY 2013) and SIMR targets for FFY 2014-2018:

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	1.47%

FFY 2014-FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	1.5%	1.5%	2.5%	3.0%	3.5%

Description

Description

Through the SSIP, PRDE hopes to improve performance of students with disabilities on the PPAA specifically within the following parameters:

- Students in sixth grade;
- Who attend focus schools in the Yabucoa School District;
- In the subject of Mathematics.

PRDE hopes that the interventions of the SSIP will result in increases in percentage of students who attain 'proficient' or above each year. As discussed throughout the SSIP, and in large part in the data analysis section, PRDE engaged in a systemic process with extensive stakeholder involvement in order to select the SIMR.

As discussed with the stakeholder group, PRDE has established measurable and rigorous targets for each successive year of the SSIP (FFYs 2014 through 2018) which require PRDE to more than double the percentage of special education student who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools in the Yabucoa School District.

PRDE notes that while this SIMR focuses on improving a result for a subset of the SEA population of students with disabilities, implementing this SSIP will have an impact on the Statewide results. First, the targets aim for an increase in a subset of the overall measurement for Ind. 3C. Even a small increase here will increase the overall results for 3C. More importantly, while the SIMR focuses on grade 6 assessment, the interventions will be implemented in grades four (4) through six (6), and as such, we expect to see increases in the fourth and fifth grade assessments as well, which will also increase the results in Ind. 3C. These interventions for grades 4 through 6 at the selected schools began in January 2015. The first class of 6th grade students who have received the interventions will be taking the assessment this spring will have had the interventions for only a couple months before taking the exam. The second group, which will take the assessment in spring 2016, will have had the interventions for an entire school year. The third group, testing in spring 2017, will have had two full years of interventions (their entire 5th and 6th grade years) while the fourth and future groups will have had three full years with the interventions (their entire 4th, 5th, and 6th grade years). The idea is that the longer the students have consistently had these interventions, the better the chances of success they will have in attaining proficiency on the 6th grade mathematics assessment. Moreover, we expect the impacts of the interventions to continue beyond sixth grade leading to improved results in assessments in later grades as well. As such, improving results on this SIMR by implementing this SSIP will improve results on Inc. 3C overall on a Statewide basis.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Additionally, PRDE hopes to expand implementation of these interventions from the 9 focus schools in the Yabucoa district to all focus schools island-wide. Currently, there are 128 elementary level focus schools throughout PRDE. The following table reflects the percentage of sixth (6th) grade students with disabilities who took the Mathematics PPAA in April 2014 that attended focus schools.

Table 11-Percentage of 6th Grade Students with Disabilities taking the Mathematics PPAA who Attend Focus Schools

Sixth Grade Students with Disabilities Who Took the Mathematics PPAA in April 2014	
A. Number Attending Focus Schools	1323
B. Number Attending All Schools	8760
<i>Percentage Attending Focus Schools (A divided by B)</i>	15.1%

As reflected above, 15.1% of all 6th grade students with disabilities who took the mathematics PPAA in April 2014 attended focus schools. Withstanding significant changes in school populations or focus school designations, PRDE SAEI anticipates this percentage to maintain relatively steady in coming years. As such, upon PRDE’s planned expansion of the interventions to all focus schools, PRDE will directly be impacting 15.1% of this population. As discussed in prior sections, focus schools generally reflect lower achieving populations. Targeting the SSIP effort in these schools has the potential to have a significant impact on a State-wide basis.

Following the second semester of 2014-2015, the PRDE SAEI will analyze data to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions in the District of Yabucoa. This will be evaluated using the database of 2015 assessment results, as well as analysis of periodic academic evaluations and student progress reports that are issued at the 10 week, 20 week, 30 week, and 40 week points throughout the school year. Through this effort, necessary adjustments can be made in advance of expanding the interventions island-wide.

During the first semester of the 2015-2016 school year, PRDE SAEI hopes to expand the SSIP interventions to all 128 elementary-level focus schools. This will be done with the support of staff from the central level through the district level, who will ensure the continuity of work and intervention implementation in each school. This was a decision discussed with and recommended by stakeholders.

The SIMR is clearly based on PRDE’s data and State infrastructure analyses. Figure Three lists the components at the central and school district levels that will be supporting this initiative.

Figure 3- PRDE Resources Involved in Implementing the SSIP Initiative

The central level component, along with the stakeholder group, will work on the development and logistics of the required interventions to attend to the needs of each school. In coordination with district level personnel, PRDE assures it will offer, to the teachers of the selected schools, professional development on the identified topics. This will be accompanied by follow-up from the school district with the support of the Special Education Academic Facilitator who will serve as a liaison with the Educational Region. During this follow-up, work sessions will be held with teachers to evaluate the application of strategies discussed in offered professional development workshops.

Additionally, support will be provided with internal resources from the agency, specifically the support of the Differentiated Support Networks (RADs by the acronym in Spanish) at focus schools (please refer to the extensive discussion of the RADs in the Infrastructure Analysis section). As previously discussed, the RADs were established through PRDE’s ESEA Flexibility Plan. In light of these resources and our infrastructure analysis, PRDE SAEI, in order to avoid duplicity of effort and maximize results of the Flexibility Plan efforts, the SSIP interventions will be integrated with the RAD support efforts. The RADs are providing special attention to activities related to serving students with disabilities in grades 4 through 6 in the identified schools. Moreover, the RAD has among its responsibilities, the creation of workshops aimed at attending to previously identified themes for each subject area. As part of the special education themes to be addressed in these schools is identifying needs related to the SSIP.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

As previously discussed and explained in detail, one of the determining factors leading to the selection of Indicator 3C as the area of focus for the SSIP was close relationship to goals of implementing PRDE's ESEA Flexibility Plan. Below we discuss our coherent improvement strategies in two parts: district level efforts initiated through the ESEA Flexibility Plan (which are discussed in great detail as a part of our infrastructure analysis) and SAE-specific efforts being provided in addition to the ESEA Flexibility Plan efforts.

Throughout PRDE's ESEA Flexibility Plan, schools designated as focus schools are assigned an external service provider to serve as their RAD. The RADs are external providers that have the responsibility of offering services aimed at school transformation and school turnaround. The efforts are to be focused on increasing the academic achievement of students and teacher professional development, taking into consideration the specific needs of each school, including the needs of students with disabilities. They will offer individualized attention in administrative and academic areas for each school that they serve. As discussed earlier in our SSIP, all schools selected to receive SSIP interventions are focus schools. As such, all schools participating in the SSIP are receiving the support of a RAD.

Generally, each RAD shall implement coherent and integrated interventions and improvement strategies that shall offer: administrative support, programmatic interventions, extended schedules, and improved relationships with the school community. Additionally, the RAD shall apply models, strategies, services, and activities that have been proven effective in improving academic achievement, including differentiated instruction for students with disabilities. To ensure the interventions carried out by these providers are aligned with academic standards and current curricular materials, these providers participate in trainings offered by PRDE personnel regarding current curricular materials, planning, differentiated instructions, and strategies adopted by the Subsecretary for Academic Affairs, so that they may be able to dominate these themes.

Specifically, the RAD support to the schools focuses on the following areas:

1. **Administrative and Operational Support** – The administrative and operational support is based in providing tools to school personnel to carry out their work in more efficiently. They provide support, training, and follow up to achieve effective implementation of the work plan established for the school year, maximize resources, and comply with academic work efforts. For Special Education, the services in this area include:
 - Assistance in coordinating academic support to general Education teachers from Special Education Academic Facilitators with the goal of supporting teachers and providing them with differentiated Education strategies in teaching special Education students participating in the general curriculum / general classroom setting.
 - Support to ensure appropriate distribution of equipment and didactic materials necessary for serving this student population.

1. **Learning Communities** – Through this initiative, the RAD will be providing resources and strategies with the purpose of significantly integrating the community and enriching the educational process.

2. **Workshops** - Some of the themes that will be covered through the workshops are:
 - a. Data Driven Decision Making
 - b. Educational Leadership
 - c. School Climate and Culture
 - d. Discipline and Security/Safety
 - e. Assessment
 - f. Planning differentiated integration, individualized instruction, and construction of knowledge.
 - g. Attending to special student needs, training of pedagogical strategies, accommodations, and alternate evaluations.

1. **Individual Coaching** – For school directors and teachers that provide instruction by core subject area, including mathematics, and special education.

2. **Group Coaching** – This is by establishing learning communities by grade or material area, including teachers of Special Education.

3. **Provide follow-up on Basic Materials and Special education, in the areas of:**
 - Planning process and academic achievement in the classroom.
 - Demonstrative Classes.
 - Modeling differentiated instruction.
 - Effective utilization of various evaluation methods.
 - Utilizing student data to guarantee effective differentiated instruction.

 - Attending to the needs identified through classroom observations, school transformation plan, and the results from evaluations and teacher requests.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1. **Instruction (Extended Learning Time** of one hundred forty-four (144) hours during the school year) for the core subject areas with an emphasis on Spanish and Mathematics – Each RAD, along with the school director, is to design a program that provides this extended learning time for students for enrichment and the instruction necessary to meet academic standards.

In addition to the above mentioned support, the RADs will be responsible for:

- Strengthening and promoting teacher use of curricular materials developed and aligned to PRDE's new standards, particularly curriculum maps and sequencing calendars according to focuses of the PRDE academic programs.
- Support the design and implementation of instructional strategies that permit students to dominate PRDE grade level standards with a special emphasis of Mathematics and Spanish. These strategies include strengthening development of linguistic concepts and mathematics, creating intellectually challenging activities that permit students to continuously advance to superior levels based on their competencies.
- In cooperation with PRDE, support the implementation of internal evaluation administration in Focus Schools to measure progress of students in subjects of Spanish, English, Mathematics, and create systems for managing and using these data in the school community.

Specific to the Yabucoa District, the district special assistant (i.e., superintendent) directed the RADs for the selected schools within the district to provide special attention to addressing needs of students with disabilities in the general curriculum in grades four through six in the area of mathematics.

In addition to the agency-wide efforts PRDE is implementing, the SAEE has begun to develop a series of improvement strategies aimed at strengthening infrastructure. Among these efforts are:

- The SAEE has joined efforts with the Yabucoa District with the purpose of carrying out coordinated work to address both the ESEA Flexibility and SSIP initiatives. Initially, orientation sessions were held to present the SSIP and evaluate how SAEE and special education staff would be able to strengthen support provided by the RADs. Working sessions were coordinated to analyze the planned interventions in the selected schools, including staff from the School District and the RADs.
- Review of the functions of the Special Education Facilitator of the District in order to focus on offering Technical assistance to the schools.
- As previously discussed, there had been a need to fill Special Education Facilitator positions in the District. SAEE was approved for fill the vacant positions, and then successfully filled all of those positions.
- As part of the ESEA Flexibility Plan, the SAEE is conducting a needs assessment regarding technical assistance for teachers with regard to special education, beginning with focus schools (as defined within the Flexibility Plan). The purpose is to prepare an intervention plan based on the needs identified by each school. This intervention plan will operate in coordination with the RADs, the companies who are contracted to provide support services directly to the schools.
- There was an orientation for Special Education Planning during October 21st, 2014 to Special Education Teachers of all regions. The speakers were Mr. Felipe Olmeda (Ponce, Caguas and Mayagüez- Regions) and Jorge Pérez (for Arecibo, Bayamón, Humacao and San Juan Regions). On November 12 and 18, 2014, Mr. Felipe Olmeda attended to a pair of orientations relating technical assistance in the Barranquitas District to Special Education teachers.
- Also, there was a second training to the Special Education Facilitators of Humacao Region, during December 4, 2014, to clarify questions and doubts related to ESEA Flexibility. The subjects discussed were Public Policy in the Planning of Learning and Curriculum Processes, and the participants included Special Ed Facilitators and Teachers.
- A residential workshop about differentiated instruction with an emphasis on students with disabilities was held. This workshop was provided for Academic Subject Material Facilitators as well as Special Education Facilitators. The goal is to prepare a district work plan for how the team would work together to train schools about this theme.

In addition to the strategies already implemented, and as discussed with and evaluated by the Stakeholder Group, the SAEE will be impacting Focus Schools in the additional following ways:

- In accordance with PRDE's ESEA Flexibility Plan, the district special assistant (superintendent) is charged with developing an intervention and academic monitoring plan that includes regular visits to the schools by Academic Facilitators, which includes the Special Education Facilitator. The frequency of the visits depends on the given school's classification. As all schools at issue in the SSIP are focus schools, these schools will be visited once each week. The goal of monitoring plan is to ensure the effective use by the schools of the curricular materials and implementation of PRDE's academic public policy initiatives, to help teachers with the use of data for developing differentiated academic instruction, to provide job-embedded professional development to teachers to assist them in using the different academic intervention strategies, and to develop corrective actions to attend to teacher needs.
- The SAEE will establish Intervention Plans based on needs assessments carried out at each Focus School.
- The SAEE will establish a Professional Development Plan to impact math teachers and special Education teachers at focus schools who teach fourth through sixth grade. Among the first themes that will be addressed as part of this plan are reasonable accommodations and differentiated instruction. Nonetheless, these themes may vary depending on the needs identified at each school as a result of Special Education Academic Facilitator intervention

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

activities.

- The SAE will continue holding periodic meetings between Special Education Academic Facilitators, Mathematic Facilitators, and the RAD coordinators / 'coaches', with the goal of coordinating efforts to establish and share intervention strategies that results in the highest levels of success. Also, these meetings will aim to promoting teamwork between math teachers from the general curriculum and special education teachers.

In summary, all of these activities, both those initially contemplated through the ESEA Flexibility Plan and those involving added resources and efforts lead by SAE and special education staff, work to support the following key improvement initiatives: conducting school specific needs assessments for serving students with disabilities, providing professional development for teachers on serving students with disabilities that is coordinated between the SAE and the districts and school RAD, assuring necessary resources are in place such as necessary academic facilitators, and district level academic monitoring to ensure compliance with ESEA Flexibility activities and goals. These activities are based on and supported by PRDE's data and infrastructure analyses, consider current PRDE initiatives, and are targeting at addressing root casus for low performance and building capacity to achieve the SIMR for children with disabilities. Additionally as discussed earlier in the SSIP, PRDE SAE has plans to scale up intervention of improvement strategies to additional schools. Also, the effectiveness of the improvement strategies will be continuously reviewed and revised or further scaled up as necessary.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

As depicted below in our Theory of Action graphic, PRDE believes that IF it implements the combination of the following interventions:

- Conducting a school specific needs assessment for serving students with disabilities;
- Providing professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the needs assessment (in a coordinated fashion between the SAE, the RADs and the school district);
- Assignment of additional resources such as ensuring a district level special education facilitator is in place as well as those services provided to the school by the RAD (discussed above); and,
- An Academic Monitoring plan carried out by the district to ensure compliance with the Flexibility Plan,

THEN, the result will be in improved performance of students with disabilities taking the PPAA at the participating schools. Moreover, PRDE anticipates that the more time in which students are served with these interventions, the more improvement can be expected with their PPAA results. As such, with the interventions being implemented in 4th through 6th grade, while PRDE expects to see results in the first year, PRDE believes that greater results will be seen in future years as those students will have been served with these interventions for longer periods of time. As such, stakeholders believe that this theory of action has a high likelihood of leading to a measurable improvement in the SIMR.

Stakeholders were involved in the development of the Theory of Action. Multiple meetings were held with the Stakeholder Group where general needs were identified first, and later after those needs were validated through visits the district and school and those needs were validated. Similarly, the group discussed the strategies that would be utilized to address the needs that would be most likely to result in academic gains for students.

The below graphic illustration shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies described throughout this document will lead to achievement of improved results for children with disabilities.

Additionally, we are including a second graphic that addresses concerns/assumptions raised by the stakeholders that may impact the achievement of students with disabilities, coherent improvement strategies identified to address these needs, and expected outcomes from implementing these activities. In establishing these items, stakeholders considered the data and infrastructure analyses. The arrows demonstrate the relation between the information in each box.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Part B

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II

The Associated Secretariat of Special Education (SAEE by its initials in Spanish) of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE), with the collaborative support of the United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs, as part of the Results Driven Accountability efforts presents its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with the purpose of improving child-level outcomes for students with disabilities. The SSIP is the new Indicator 17 for the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Improvement Act (IDEA) State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR).

After a broad analysis during Phase I, PRDE along with the stakeholder group agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities taking the PPAA in mathematics within the Yabucoa District. Considering the infrastructure analysis, the determination was later made to further focus the SSIP on those students attending schools within the Yabucoa District designated as 'focus schools' through PRDE's ESSA Flexibility [\[1\]](#). The focus schools from the Yabucoa District which will be referred as participating schools are:

- Calzada (Maunabo)
- Marín Abajo (Patillas)
- Eugenio María de Hostos (San Lorenzo)
- Luis Muñoz Rivera (San Lorenzo)
- Gerardo Selles Sola (San Lorenzo)
- Quemados (San Lorenzo)
- Quebrada Honda/SU Isidro Vicens (San Lorenzo)
- Dra. María T. Delgado de Marcano (San Lorenzo)
- Jorge Rosario del Valle (San Lorenzo)

As stated at the outset of this SSIP, the following table reflect the SIMR baseline data (FFY 2013) and SIMR targets for FFY 2014-2018 and results for FFY 2014:

Baseline Data FFY 2013 - Data 1.47%

FFY 2014-FFY 2018 Targets and Data

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	<u>Baseline</u>	1.5%	1.5%	2.5%	3.0%	3.5%
Data	1.47%	3.51%				

Description of Measurement

Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools scoring at or above proficient against grade level) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled in sixth grade at the selected schools who received a valid score on the PPAA and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and calculated for math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Data Analysis for Phase II of the SSIP

In Phase I, PRDE established measurable and rigorous targets for each successive year of the SSIP (FFYs 2014 through 2018) which requires PRDE to more than double the percentage of special education student who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools in the Yabucoa School District.

As a result of the interventions implemented for the school District, the external providers (RAD) and the SAEE, the data shows that the proposed target of 1.5% for FFY 2014 was exceeded, reaching 3.51%. The analysis of the data below is based on the *Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico* (PPAA) results for the 2014-2015 school year.

FFY	2014
Data	3.51%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This analysis was conducted for the purpose of calculating the percentage of special education students from the 6th grade who scored proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected SIMR schools in the Yabucoa School District.

As described in Phase I of the SSIP, PRDE notes that while this SIMR focuses on improving a result for a subset of the population of students with disabilities, implementing this SSIP has an impact on the Statewide results. PRDE seeks eventually to implement this initiative island-wide and not limit the implementation to the Yabucoa District. Taking a more global look, the 2014-2015 assessment results for students with disabilities at all grade levels reveal that math scores increased 0.82% island-wide as compared to last year's scores. The graph below illustrates the increase. The increase in students attaining proficiency is positive, however, the increase in the SIMR for 2014-2015 is at a greater rate.

Analysis by Year of the Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on Math

Stakeholder's Involvement

As mentioned in Phase I, for the start of Phase II of the SSIP, the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the selected topic. The additional resources incorporated into the stakeholder group were: Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa School District (who is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Flexibility Plan in the District of Yabucoa), PRDE Director of the Mathematics Program, a School Director, and a Special Education Teacher. The school director and special education teacher were selected from outside of the Yabucoa District, with the purpose of providing classroom and school director level perspectives without the influence of being individuals who would be directly involved with the initial SSIP efforts. The selected school director came from a school designated as a school of excellence under the ESSA Flexibility. The special education teacher was selected in part due to her being a specialist with mathematics instruction and assessment.

PRDE developed Phase II with broad stakeholder input. The stakeholder group has been instrumental since the beginning of the SSIP process. PRDE SAEI held various meetings with stakeholder groups and received stakeholder input regarding all three components of Phase II of the SSIP. At first, PRDE SAEI made attempts to involve stakeholder groups which included teachers, school director, district and municipality special education facilitator, and other resources for different units in the PRDE. Through the work, PRDE SAEI experienced challenges due to the large number of stakeholders and the difficulty scheduling meetings so that everyone could be present. PRDE SAEI determined it was necessary to identify a smaller number of stakeholders who could represent all facets of the Island and be able to be present for ongoing meetings.

Additionally, the collaboration with PRDE's Under-secretariat of Academic Affairs, (this is the area in charge of the general education) has promoted an excellent communication with the District Special Assistant of Yabucoa. Both, the District Special Assistant of Yabucoa and the Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa District have been engaged in the implementation of the SSIP in their District and have served as the liaison between the school directors for the schools that have been selected to participate in the SSIP initiative.

Stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in every phase of the SSIP. Below will be presented a **summary** of the stakeholder's participation for this phase. Please note that stakeholder's input is also discussed throughout the SSIP, not solely in this section.

Stakeholder Participation	Summary	Input
Meetings	1-Phase I submission was presented to the group. 2-Discussion of Phase II Components.	1-They demonstrated satisfaction with the document. 2-The group in consensus determined to continue with the SIMR presented in Phase I.

Closing of Phase I

Component #1: Infrastructure

Meetings	1-Analysis of the SIMR Results	1-The stakeholder group analyzed the SIMR results and recommended to continue with the strategies and the alignment with ESSA Flexibility. Also, the group was pleased with the results achieved and student's improvement.
Conference calls	1-Changes in the Infrastructure	1-Stakeholder recommended the importance of including in Phase II the restructuring that is undergoing PRDE. They agreed that these changes were aligned to the academic transformation and benefit the student's achievement.
Emailed Input	1-Discussion of Component #1 Draft	1-Various stakeholder group members submitted their recommendations to the draft.

Component #2: Evidence Based Practices

Meetings	1-Discussion of EBPs	1- The stakeholder group considered that our SSIP is aligned with ESSA Flexibility and the EBPs that have to be used are the established in the ACSPOG (PCEA Guide). The group presented the concern of the limitation of the availability of EBPs for math.
Meetings	1-Discussion of SAEIs participation in the Math Collaborative and TA Visit	1-A summary of the knowledge acquired and the documentation provided during both events were discussed and analyzed with the group. As part of the discussion it was determined to use these

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Stakeholder Participation	Summary	Input
		materials as references.
Emailed Input	1-Discussion of Component #2 Draft	1-Variou stakeholder group members submitted their recommendations to the draft. Also input from other areas of PRDE were received.

Component #3: Evaluation

Meetings	1-Discussion of PRDE's Evaluation Plan	1-The stakeholder group considered to use current infrastructure for evaluation that is established by ESSA Flexibility. They enhanced the importance of evaluating the results of the professional development activities provided by the SAE. Also, it was determined as part of the SAE's evaluation to monitor and include the achievement through the school year of the participating students.
Emailed Input Conference call	1-Discussion of SAE Evaluation Instrument	1-The stakeholder group made recommendations to the document, which were included. They also recommended that this evaluation should be done by a core stakeholder group.
Emailed Input	1-Discussion of Component #2 Draft	1-Variou stakeholder group members submitted their recommendations to the draft. Also input from other areas of PRDE were received.

[1] It is important to note that with the change in the ESSA Law from 2016 Flexibility Plan became the Academic Transformation Plan with DEPR Longitudinal view of which is aligned with federal requirements.

Component #1: Infrastructure Development

General Infrastructure Changes

Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) operates as a unitary system with a central level lead by the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education. Under the Secretary of Education are two Special Secretaries. One focuses on academic affairs, while the other is focused on administrative affairs. The central level office leadership also includes a Special Education Secretary who oversees the SAE and the Auxiliary Secretary of Transformation, Planning and Performance. PRDE divides the island geographically into seven educational regions and 28 school districts, which include four districts per educational region.

The districts are branches of PRDE that operate under the direction of a District level Special Assistant who supervises all academic activities of the schools within the geographical boundaries of the given region. As part of the district structure, the district level staffing includes academic facilitators for core academic subjects (Spanish, Mathematics, English, Science and Special Education) who function as instructional leaders for teachers, serve as coaches, and facilitate professional development regarding curriculum and instructional strategies. These facilitators also provide support in the design of programs adjusted to address the needs of specific students in the school and they collaborate with School Directors in the development of programs for a variety of student subgroups such as the gifted, low performing students, students at-risk of dropping out of school, students enrolled in special education, and students with limited Spanish proficiency. The districts are also responsible for the coordination of professional development activities for teachers and other school support personnel. As reported in Phase I, the SSIP infrastructure is aligned with PRDE's approved ESSA Flexibility Plan. It is worth noting that Puerto Rico's ESSA Flexibility Plan was approved for three years and without special conditions. The chart below present the PRDE structure previously described.

As part of PRDE's efforts to improve student learning, provide appropriate services, and demonstrate fiscal discipline, PRDE is currently undertaking a comprehensive restructuring and academic transformation with longitudinal vision. This transformation is framed in a systemic vision that puts our students and graduates as agents of change in both their active participation in society and in the reenergizing of our economy. The restructuring plan will greatly improve PRDE's infrastructure and improve PRDE's ability to support regions and districts. Additionally, PRDE has carefully maintained functions and positions that are essential to complying with Federal requirements, including the SSIP and PRDE ESSA Flexibility. Some of the main objectives of the Restructuring plan include the following:

- Achieve a more efficient operational structure focused on the needs of students and schools.
- Create administrative and academic functions focused on providing services that meet the needs of schools.
- Improve academic performance and increase student retention by establishing a new integrative curriculum.
- Strengthen academic interventions in schools to reduce student transitions within our system. Before, the PRDE system promote at least two transitions: in sixth grade and in nine grade. In the new vision the students only have one transition in eighth grade, this promote school retention.
- Provide support services to educators through the establishment of a service-oriented culture to reduce bureaucracy and streamline processes.
- Reduce organizational levels and optimized resources.
- Promote the use of data in decision making.
- Demonstrate fiscal discipline by implementing a rigorous cost control to maximize resources for public education.
-

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Changes will occur in phases. The first phase of restructuring impacted the following units: Secretariat for Academic Affairs, Associate Secretary of Special Education and the Auxiliary Secretariat of Transformation, Planning and Performance (previously the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Educational Development) and the Auxiliary Secretariat of Human Resources. The changes to the units that impact the SSIP will be discussed next.

Secretariat for Academic Affairs

The transformation of the Secretariat for Academic Affairs includes a complete reconceptualization of the central level and academic aspects of educational regions and school districts with the goal of improving the academic services offered. The new structure has new functional areas focused on the academic goals of the department. These areas have a direct interrelation between the central level and the implementation that takes place in school districts with a new design framed in a horizontal and vertical management that promotes the development of learning communities. One of these new areas is the Academic Transformation Unit. Some of the functions of this new area are:

- Promote the systematic, creative and transformative thinking based on scientific basis strategies.
- Develop innovative projects aimed at transforming school communities.
- Establish and promote data-based plans work.
- Strengthen strategies for differentiated interventions, such as the Differentiated Support Network, (RAD by its acronym in Spanish)
- Develops the methodology to measure the work plans and intervention strategies to ensure they are resulting in students' academic improvement and development of an effective school community.

The main objective of the restructuring of the Secretariat for Academic Affairs is to strengthen the academic services offered to schools and students, from a systemic vision focused on the development of essential skills of the Student Graduate School Profile. This involves the formation of global citizens capable of transforming our society and economy to compete as equal in our society.

Associate Secretary of Special Education

Under the restructuring plan, the Associate Secretary of Special Education (SAEE, by its acronym in Spanish) will strengthen its academic component and consolidate its administrative support in an effort to make the office more effective and efficient. Additionally, at the district level, the restructuring plan focuses on strengthening the academic unit that services special education students placed in public schools. Despite these change several features of the PRDE SAEE Central level will remain the same.

For example, as previously reported in Phase I, at the PRDE SAEE central level, SAEE is made up of Technical Assistance and Academic Support Unit which consists of seven (7) Special Education Academic Facilitators. This unit also responds to the needs of and provides assistance to the eleven (11) Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs by its acronym in Spanish). In general, this unit has the following responsibilities:

- Establish SAEE Public Policy in the Academic Area
- Work with the following topics: serving deaf, blind, and deaf-blind students; placement alternatives; early childhood transition; post-secondary transition, autism; and, adaptive physical education.
- Coordinate, via the district-level Special Education Academic Facilitators, activities related to academic support and Technical assistance to schools.
- Prepare and execute Professional Development activities for district, municipal, and CSEE level Special Education Academic Facilitators focused on increase the academic achievement of students with disabilities.
- Ensure specific interventions are being carried out in the schools in compliance with the ESSA Flexibility Plan are realized.
- Through the CSEEs, coordinate the provision of Special Education services from child find/identification through placement of students.

Each Special Education Academic Facilitator is assigned to a region for the purpose of maintaining constant communication with the different levels that make up PRDE's infrastructure. Three of the seven facilitator positions at the central level are currently vacant, due to PRDE fiscal problems. Nevertheless, PRDE has taken the necessary steps to ensure that all regions continue to receive technical assistance services offered by the central level. Facilitators have been redistributed so that they are responsible for more than one region. PRDE is also working on identifying additional resources to cover the three vacancies.

Auxiliary Secretariat of Transformation, Planning and Performance

The Auxiliary Secretary of Transformation, Planning and Performance (SATPRE, by its acronym in Spanish) is responsible for designing and promoting public policy which benefits students across the island. Additionally, SATPRE will increase its role in strategic planning for PRDE. For example, it is PRDE's goal for SATPRE to assume the implementation and monitoring of the strategic plans across all units, programs and special projects developed in the Department. As part of the transformation, two existing units will have an increased importance: Data Management Governance and the Research and Educational Innovations Center.

School District Changes

The restructuring and academic transformation at PRDE wants to ensure that with its current infrastructure refocusing their staff functions will better support the academic achievement of our students. As such, the new district design is framed in a horizontal and vertical management that promotes the development of learning communities and professional practice. As part of the administrative and academic transformation PRDE is particularly focused on:

- The Under-secretariat for Academic Affairs and Associate Secretary of Special Education have outlined new roles for academic district officials focused on the differentiated instruction to assure needs of all students are met.
-
- The academic approach proposed in the district will be supported by various systemic implementation guidelines which ensure offering integrated services geared towards meeting the different needs of schools. Additionally, this approach supports teachers to impart effective differentiated instruction according to each student subgroup.
-
- The district will continue to develop high quality interventions to ensure that every school principal and teacher can be effective in using different evidence based practices.
-

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- The district will focus developing an evaluation system which ensures schools the implement of rigorous standards and expectations. Additionally, districts will ensure that each school makes data-based decisions, meeting the needs of various subgroups of students, including students with disabilities.
-
- Support interventions, monitoring and evaluation will be recorded in platforms to have more effective interventions.

In addition to the organizational changes occurring at the district level, changes are also occurring at the school level. PRDE is in the process of restructuring school levels into elementary (which will include grades kindergarten through eighth grade) and secondary (ninth through twelfth grade). The purpose of the restructuring is to increase school retention and improve academic performance. It should be noted that the restructuring at the school level is also being implemented by phases. This aspect was discussed with the stakeholder group but concluded that the changes have not affected the SIMR at this moment. However, the group will evaluate the changes as they occur to verify if these changes could affect our SIMR.

It is important to note that the restructuring of the PRDE described previously be outlined and worked by the undersecretaries, associate secretaries and auxiliary secretaries of each of the areas impacted in the first phase as well as by key personnel from each of these areas, with knowledge's in PRDE most important projects and initiatives. This key personnel, that include Specials Assistances, Directors, etc., through multiple meetings and work sessions, helped develop the model restructuring and academic transformation with longitudinal vision that currently implements the department. In the SAEE, the Associate Secretary include as part of the restructuring working group the Compliance Officer to assure that the department transformation consider the aspects that the SAEE and the PRDE have to work to improve the academic achievements for special education students.

Additional efforts that ensure SSIP Implementation align with PRDE's ESSA Flexibility Plan

As we previously mentioned in Phase I, PRDE chose a SIMR that focused on increasing the percentage of special education students in the 6th grade who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math because this goal is consistent with focus of PRDE's ESSA Flexibility Waiver. As established in PRDE's ESSA Flexibility, each school district will continue providing technical assistance to support teachers with professional development in order to maintain high expectations and academic rigor.

The focus schools (schools with the lowest graduation rates or largest achievement gaps) share similar components to those offered to priority schools (lowest performing schools). These similarities include: the creation of professional learning communities, creating a culture of decision making based on data, integration of parents and the community in the educational process, program extended learning time with at least 144 additional hours per year, and individualized professional development to address the most urgent problems. In addition, the services of the focus schools will continue concentrate on serving subgroups of students with the aim of closing the achievement gap between groups, with particular attention to special education students and limited Spanish proficiency students.

As part of PRDE's efforts to strengthen its infrastructure to comply with its ESSA Flexibility, PRDE continue partnered with external providers, known as Differentiated Support Network (*Red de Apoyo Diferenciado* or RAD by its acronym in Spanish). Specifically, the RAD support to the schools focuses on the following areas:

1. Administrative and Operational Support
2. Learning Communities
3. Workshops
4. Individual Coaching
5. Group Coaching
6. Provide follow-up on Math and Special education, in the areas of:
 - Planning process and academic achievement in the classroom.
 - Demonstrative Classes.
 - Modeling differentiated instruction.
 - Effective utilization of various evaluation methods.
 - Utilizing student data to guarantee effective differentiated instruction.
 - Attending to the needs identified through classroom observations, school transformation plan, and the results from evaluations and teacher requests.
7. Extended Learning Time

The RADs continue offering administrative and academic support individualized to address the specific areas of need for each school. The RADs also continue help schools in planning and implementation of the interventions designed to result in school transformation. Each school community, in cooperation with its assigned external service provider (i.e., its RAD), works to achieve the goals established in the school's intervention plan (which is used by the school to prepare the PCEA). This intervention plan is to contain and address the school's needs and the specific reasons for why they school has been identified as focus.

During the next school year, the RADs continue offering individualized attention in administrative and academic areas to schools in order to help schools plan and implement interventions that result in school transformation. RADs also continue offering professional development services such as workshops and coaching to schools throughout the academic year.

In the academic support area, RADs continue provide direct support in core subject areas such as Mathematics, Spanish, English and Science. By developing interventions and providing direct support, RADs will continue helped schools to increase the academic achievement of students and aid in closing the achievement gap between students in each subgroup. RADs also continue helped teachers develop a deeper understanding of the academic content and make the content accessible to all subgroups. As part of the required services (established in the Request for Proposal or RFP), service providers and school principals meet with school districts with the goal of ensuring the link between the selected strategies and meets PRDE established public policy. RADs will continue collecting and analyzing data in order to demonstrate that they meet their stated objectives to improve the performance of focus schools. They use the data to illustrate that they are implementing reasonable and valid solutions designed to meet the needs of schools and support the school community.

Additionally, for the purpose of strengthening processes in focus schools and provide better academic service to students, the Undersecretary for Academic Affairs, in collaboration with Florida and the Islands Comprehensive Center (FLICC), has designed an eclectic model of professional communities learning (MECPA). The model is designed to strengthen the academic database with the aim of improving the academic achievement of students. MECPA facilitates the achievement of the objectives of the ESSA Flexibility, as well as contributes to the achievement of the SSIP objectives.

PRDE is also working on developing online demonstration classes that will be available on PRDE's website. These videos describe best practices related to: planning, how to use curricular maps to develop performance tasks and making decisions based on data. In addition, subject to the availability of funds, PRDE will also work to develop additional online professional development resources for teachers.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Considering the specific needs of students with Autism, the Associate Secretary of Special Education has integrated the STAR/Links curriculum. STAR is a specialized curriculum for students with autism that combines standards with meeting the needs of students. The STAR curriculum is based on the ABA, TEACCH, PECS and other strategies. It is also aligned with the "Common Core State Standards" (CCSS). The elementary STAR program includes detailed lesson plan and teaching materials based on all six curricular assessment areas which are receptive language, expressive language, language spontaneous, functional routines, academic and social skills games. At the intermediate level, the program promotes student independence in natural environments. The online system Links provides teachers with the necessary tools to successfully teach life skills and independence to students.

This implementation will be divided in cycles and each cycle in turn is divided by cohort. PRDE will work with a total of two cycles and four cohorts (two cohorts per cycle) each with a total of seven (7) groups or "sites". Each cycle will begin with the training phase and will continue with follow-up visits to ensure implementation and provide teachers with the necessary support. It should be noted that the school Jorge Rosario Vega, which is one of the schools in the District of Yabucoa impacted through SSIP, is part of the 3rd cycle of implementation for this curriculum.

In the table below illustrates the cycles in which implementation will occur

Cohort	Date of Workshops (Workshops)	Implementation Period (Coach visits to ensure implementation)
Cohort 1	August 2015	September 2015 – March 2016
Cohort 2	September 2015	October 2015 – April 2016
Cohort 3	January 2016	January 2016 – May 2016
Cohort 4	January 2016	January 2016 – May 2016

In order to support the management of academic transformation and maintain compliance with PRDE's ESSA Flexibility and the SSIP, PRDE has developed a series of platforms in order to benefit the schools, the district and the central level. PRDE uses these new technology platforms to ensure implementation of interventions that are being developed at the level school and district levels. These new technology platforms are the following:

1. PCEA Live - This is an online platform that supports the development of the PCEA for each school. The platform delineates specific interventions for schools according to their rankings under to the ESSA flexibility plan. For the past two years, staff at the district level have provided ongoing support to principals and in the area of data analysis. Principals and teachers have requested additional support to develop interventions suited to their specific needs. Since January 2014, central level staff have designed and offered support based on the classification of each school.
- 2.
3. SAMA – PRDE developed the Support and Academic Monitoring System platform (SAMA by its acronym in Spanish) to enable central level staff and district personnel to provide monitoring and feedback to schools as they implement their plans. In addition, central level staff members use SAMA to hold monthly meetings with district staff to assess progress, identify support needs and provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure that all schools within the district are served.
- 4.
5. RAD or SPP – The online platform called Service Provider Platform (SPP) was developed by PRDE to manage contracted services with external suppliers and to allow systematic and computerized management. The SPP is used to obtain measurable and reportable data from schools, which in turn enables PRDE to interpret school results. It has a simple interface plan and organized service, with specific indicators that can be used to measure academic progress and related conducted at school. The SPP is also used to ensure fiscal and contractual compliance. The staff of the Office of Federal Affairs works with UTE staff to ensure that all services specified in the system are in line with the plans of the school.
- 6.
7. Dashboards - A dashboard is a technological tool that contains comparative tables and graphical summaries of key data related to schools, students and staff. PRDE dashboards include accountability indicators that are aligned with the classification criteria of accountability as well as other data necessary for making decisions based on data. The Office of Information Systems and the Auxiliary Secretary of Transformation, Planning and Performance share responsibility for a) ensuring that the dashboard contains data that are accurate and reliable, b) data is presented in a simple and easy to interpret manner, c) ensure that schools, districts, and central level have access to this information. This shared responsibility ensures the technical management (collection and presentation) of data and content, such as support for decision-making that is based on data. Dashboards allows PRDE to track principle and teacher performance data.

Collaboration between Stakeholders and Various PRDE Offices

Considering the importance of involve multiples areas and offices of the PRDE in the infrastructure improvement, SAEE include as part of the stakeholder group, representation of the different levels of the PRDE. Some resources incorporated into the stakeholder group, which has been mentioned in the phase I of SSIP included a Special Assistance of the Undersecretary of Academic Affairs, the Yabucoa Superintendent of Academic Support (whose main responsibility include guiding the implementation of curriculum and assessment, and directing the design of intervention plans for academic and special ed facilitators and ensuring that they are implemented. It is also part of her responsibilities overseeing the implementation of the ESSA Flexibility in the District of Yabucoa), a School Director, a Special Education Teacher and parents of students with disabilities. In addition, the SAEE continue joined forces with the Yabucoa School District with the goal of carrying out coordinated work to address both Flexibility and the SSIP initiatives. Quarterly meetings/working sessions were coordinated to analyze the planned interventions in the selected schools, along with employees of the school district and the RADs.

Besides the working with the district, SAEE also joined forces and working together with the RAD's Offices Director in order to assure that the selected school receive the services that was contracted and that the RAD count with specialized resources to impact special education teachers.

Improvement Strategies

In addition to the agency-wide infrastructure improvement and efforts PRDE is implementing, and the initiative than we mentioned above, the SAEE also develop a series of improvement strategies aimed at strengthening infrastructure. Among these efforts are:

- During October 2015, SAEE have meeting with all the RAD's island wide and at the District Special Assistance, to orientate them about the SSIP

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

initiative.

- As part of the joined efforts with the Yabucoa District, during this year SAEЕ provide an orientation for Differentiated Instruction on March 2016, to the math and special education teachers of the participating schools. This orientation was coordinated between the SAEЕ and the Yabucoa's Special District Assistance and was offered as a team by one SAEЕ special education facilitator and math facilitator of the Yabucoa's District.

In addition to the strategies already implemented, and as discussed with and evaluated by the Stakeholder Group, the SAEЕ will be impacting Focus Schools in the additional following ways:

- In accordance with PRDE's ESSA Flexibility, the district special assistant (superintendent) is charged with developing an intervention and academic monitoring plan that includes regular visits to the schools by Academic Facilitators, which includes the Special Education Facilitator. The goal of monitoring plan is to ensure the effective use by the schools of the curricular materials and implementation of PRDE's academic public policy initiatives, to help teachers with the use of data for developing differentiated academic instruction, to provide job-embedded professional development to teachers to assist them in using the different academic intervention strategies, and to develop corrective actions to attend to teacher needs.
- The SAEЕ will continue implementing the Professional Development Plan to impact math teachers and special Education teachers at focus schools who teach fourth through sixth grade. The themes may vary depending on the needs identified at each school as a result of Special Education Academic Facilitator intervention activities. As part of the professional development plan, SAEЕ was coordinated with the PRDE Teachers Institute for Professional Development to offer college math courses to special education teacher with the purpose to specialized de special education teachers in math.
- The SAEЕ will continue holding periodic meetings between Special Education Academic Facilitators, Mathematic Facilitators, and the RAD coordinators / 'coaches', with the goal of coordinating efforts to establish and share intervention strategies that results in the highest.

In summary, the PRDE transformation and efforts previously mentioned support directly the PRDE/SAEЕ in implementing the coherent improvement strategies and activities for both: ESSA Flexibility and SSIP. As we previously mentioned, all this effort has the purpose of improve academic performance of all PRDE students, especially the students with disabilities.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Component #2: Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

PRDEs goal is to ensure that every public school student dominates core content areas so that when students graduate from high school, they have developed the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college or a career. As reported, during Phase I, one of the criteria taken into consideration for the selection of Indicator 3 as the focus of the SSIP is the fact that this is also the focus of PRDE's ESSA Flexibility, which has an end objective of improving academic achievement for students primarily in math, with a goal of having both initiatives aligned and working together. PRDE schools should promote appropriate academic settings with the help of an effective and efficient administration that makes the best use of existing services and resources.

The Mission of Focus Schools

PRDE's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is aligned as mentioned above to APR Indicator 3C and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment (PPAA by its acronym in Spanish^[1]). Specifically, the SIMR shall be an increase in the percentage % of special education students from the 6th grade who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected **focus** schools in the Yabucoa School District. The mission of the focus schools is to provide students access to a free and nonsectarian educational system that exposes them to academic, vocational, technical and highly skilled learning. The goal of these schools is to close the gaps between the subgroups to a minimum of 50% of their previous levels and not be within the 10% of schools with the widest gaps.

Each focus school has to establish an Authentic Comprehensive School Plan (PCEA by its acronym in Spanish). **The PCEAs highlight the analysis of student's needs data to define the interventions necessary to reduce the gaps in all focus schools.** The PCEA is the organized response to a planning process which will address the needs and goals of PRDE for a set time period. This should constitute the framework to guide the activities that need to be completed during the school year. The PCEA will be valid for two (2) years and annual reviews are required. The school director in collaboration with the School's Planning Committee (SPC), has the responsibility to determine the activities and interventions that will be developed in their PCEAs according to the specific needs of their students and the interventions that have been proven to be effective. The initiatives and strategies from de SSIP are part of the operational objectives from the PCEA of every school.

PRDE will support the implementation of the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) with the strategies presented below. These strategies will be evaluated by the SPC at monthly meetings to determine if they are being effective. Evidence of these meetings are recorded by the school director in the PCEA platform. If it is identified that the strategies are not effective, amendments can be made to PCEA at any time during the year.

The PCEA allows each school to:

- document student achievement, staffing, and available resources for the current year using data available through the PRDE central data system
- document the analysis of trends in student achievement, identify root causes for poor student performance, and propose strategies for improving student achieving
- outline school-wide professional development needs and specify additional professional development necessary to meet the needs of specific subgroups of students within the school
- plan activities that reflect the interests and needs of parents, plan initiatives to engage parents in the school's educational processes and promote strong and effective family-school relationships
- plan for the use of local and federal funds for the current school year

Authentic Comprehensive School Plan Online Guide (ACSPOG)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

To contribute on the development of the PCEA, PRDE established the Authentic Comprehensive School Plan Online Guide (ACSPOG). This guide supports the school director to establish systematic and rigorous processes that lead to fostering the development of all students. The PCEA contains four fundamental principles that make up the TIAR Models. The TIAR model is: the transformation of the operational aspects; integration of students, mothers, parents, guardians, teachers, school principals, community, government agencies, nonprofit organizations and the private sector to educational management; expansion of educational offerings; and revision or creation of educational policies.

In the Authentic Comprehensive School Plan Online Guide (ACSPOG) is presented the exercise that should be done by each school director to identify the needs to be included in its PCEA. The school needs assessment is composed of two major areas: identification and the analysis of the school's needs. Both components are described in the table below.

The Analysis	Assures that:
Internal and external factors that prevent schools from achieving the desired expectations are identified during the investigation state	Ø A thorough study needs the five steps of data: student performance, processes, demographic, perception and physical and technological infrastructure.
	Ø A clear definition of the issue, situation, or problem we have to solve in order to measure their reach.
	Ø Specify the nature and magnitude of the need subsequently determines the actions to follow.
	Ø Establish priorities between different needs and determine most urgent issues within the same need.
	Ø Identify viable and realistic goals and objectives.
	Ø Determine the appropriate interventions to address the need.
	Ø Determine the time the required actions take
	Ø Determine the necessary resources to meet the needs, both human and economic.

The exercise presented above considers the school needs and is a way to assure the best fit for the coherent improvement strategies. Also, the school has a School Intervention Plan (PIE) which establishes the strategies and additional interventions. The PIE contains all subject matter Evidence Based Practices.

Evidence Based Practices (EBP)

The Authentic Comprehensive School Plan Online Guide (ACSPOG) contains the definition and the Evidence Based Practices (EBP) that the PRDE has adopted to guide the school director in the drafting of its PCEA. This way PRDE assures that the school PCEA is aligned to comply with its requirements. As defined in the ACSPOG the evidence based practices that PRDE selected "are based on scientific research", which means that when possible, the educational interventions being used must be strongly supported by evidence from well-conducted research studies. Strategies selected should be those that strengthen academic programs, increase the amount and quality of instructional time, and address the particular needs of the population^[2]. The ACSPOG contains the six criteria of evidence-based research in order to clarify and compliment the EBP definition. The six criteria are; systematic empirical methods, rigorous data analysis, based on measurement that provides valid and replicable evidence, experimental or quasi-experimental research designs, studies are clearly detailed in order for them to be easily replicable and reviewed and accepted by independent experts.

Likewise the Guide establishes the characteristics of an evidence-based research instructional program which are that:

- The program theory, strategy, or design should be evidence-based.
- Program effectiveness assessment based on evidence.
- Earnings should be evaluated by an external evaluator (consultant, researchers, state, district, team evaluation).
- The program should have been studied for at least one year and have been implemented for three years to be considered rigorous.
- The study should be able to be replicated.
- Professional development should be continuous.

Specifically, for **math** which is our main component in the SIMR, PRDE established the following EBPs to address their individual needs for students with disabilities: concept development, integration of technology, contextualized instruction, problem-based learning (PBL), curriculum integration, and research in action, differentiated instruction and focus on problem-solving. Other strategies that are included in the school's participating PIE's are: an extended learning time program, job embedded professional development plan, parent and community involvement strategy, and data driven decision making. The chart below present de EBP's that is selected for math:

Description of the EBPS Strategies for the math

- **Problem Based Learning (PBL)**

1.

This student-centered method is through which the problems of daily life are resolved to merge the different areas of knowledge necessary to solve problems. The work is done collaboratively in small groups until the problem arises to its solution. Learning is self-directed; students share their learning experience, practice skill development and its reflection on the process. Proponents of ABP believe that learning is both to know and do. Problem based learning (ABP, by its acronym in Spanish) program designers are based on the premise that students gain knowledge in each learning experience. They also consider that students are better able to learn when the following conditions are met:

- Prior knowledge is activated and encouraged to incorporate new knowledge.
- Students are given numerous opportunities to apply this knowledge
- Learning new knowledge occurs in the context in which it will be used later.

Problem-based learning is a teaching strategy – which helps with knowledge acquisition, development of skills and attitudes that are important. ABP in a small group of students meets with the facilitation of a tutor, to analyze and solve selected problems or specially designed to achieve certain learning objectives.

- **Contextualized Instruction**

1.

Teaching is based on making content relevant to students. Contextualized teaching considers the processes and uses understanding, discovery and connections in teaching. Learning is based on the construction of knowledge. The context refers to an event, situation or problems arising from reality and is meaningful to the student.

- **Concept Development**

A concept is a category that is used to group events, ideas, objects, or similar people. Learning concepts suggests that in our mind we have a prototype, example: an image that captures the essence of a given concept.

The components of a lesson for teaching concepts are:

- Examples and counterexamples
- Relevant and irrelevant attributes
- Name of the concept
- Definition of the concept
- Diagrams or maps

The concepts significantly facilitate the process of thinking. Instead of labeling and categorizing separately each new object or event, simply existing concepts are incorporated. The concepts allow you to group objects or events that share common properties and respond in the same way to each example of the concept.

- **Technology Integration (TI)** When the teacher uses digital technology, you can get students interested in their own learning and problem solving applied to subject matter or desired. For students, technology is a tool of their choice and commonly used. The Internet is used as a tool to approach knowledge that the teacher doesn't have on hand.

1. This is the more traditional approach, which views Internet and TI as tools to implement the usual educational practices. The goal is to work directly on the network, building activities and energizing conversations that move the classroom to the Internet. This includes active work of students in blogs, social bookmarking, social media campaigns, collaborative subtitling videos, etc.
2. This technique incorporates technology into the classroom as an additional tool that will help enrich the teaching-learning process. The technology will be used for individualized teaching and as a strategy of inclusion. It is a tool that will also be used in offering tutorials, practice and troubleshooting using educational material previously evaluated. If the cultural paradigm is used in the design of educational activities mediated by digital technology, the student learns to handle and appropriate knowledge, whether in the area of natural and social sciences, mathematics, geography or Spanish.

- **Curricular Integration**

Students learn best when knowledge is organized in complete units rather than isolated units. This practice presupposes that knowledge is integrated and not isolated. Classrooms should be learning communities in which all contribute to the intellectual development of their peers. Courses designed in an integrated manner, generally interest students more. Curriculum integration of prior knowledge of the child, personal experiences, reasoning, strategies, attitudes and habits should also be incorporated. The curricular integration is planned by the teacher according to the needs and interests of their students.

Strengths and the content of the subjects which are then related to the study of the subject. Through thematic units the curricular in integration promotes the development of research capacity, creativity, problem solving, language development and humanism in childhood.

Curricular integration include means for differentiating instruction for students with disabilities. Curricular maps establish performance tasks with alternative strategies for teachers to be used with students with disabilities. PRDE has only one curriculum for each content area and that curriculum applies to all students. Professional development activities highlight aspects of the curricula so that every classroom teacher has a repertoire of tools for adjusting standards-based instruction to address every student's needs.

Curriculum integration is supported by Michael Halliday's study from 1975, in which he found that children learn best to read and write when their learning contexts include significant experiences with real purposes. Instead of emphasizing the teaching of reading in isolated and decontextualized skills, children should be provided with meaningful learning experiences. Similarly, researchers like Sue Bredekamp (1987) have argued that curriculum integration works because it makes maximum use of the capacity of the brain. The human brain detects patterns and is more effective when processing meaningful information.

- **Research in action**

Research in action is an interactive inquiry process that balances problem solving skills in a collaborative context. Moreover, action research is designed and conducted by practitioners who analyze the data to improve their own practice.

The different movements born out action research point to the following as essential steps in the process:

- Reflection on a problem area, for example, students' not paying attention in class
- Planning and implementation of alternative actions to improve the problematic situation, such as the approach of new activities, new group dynamics, etc.,
- Evaluation of the results of the action taken in order to undertake a second cycle or loop of three stages. To follow the same example, the assessment of the effects caused by new activities and organization of groups proposed in the students' attention. This assessment involves the approach of new problems, as could be, the role of the teacher in the classroom.
-

- **Differentiated Instruction**

This strategy is an extension of a high-quality curriculum and not a replacement. The main role of the teacher is to ensure that the curriculum meets the needs of students and to help them use it; to build meaning of the ideas of disciplines and apply them to the world around them. Differentiated instruction maximizes the potential of each student. The teaching-learning process includes or may be directed to the whole class, small groups or individually. Teachers use the time, space, materials and educational strategies flexibly according to the needs of the students. The classrooms are conceived as learning communities and these students share with teachers the responsibility for its growth. The main function is that students achieve their educational goals through channeling and teacher support.

Coherent Improvement Strategies

As previously mentioned in Component 1 (Infrastructure), as part of PRDE's efforts to strengthen its infrastructure to comply with its ESSA Flexibility, PRDE continues partnered with external providers, known as Differentiated Support Network (*Red de Apoyo Diferenciado* or RAD by its acronym in Spanish). The RADs are external providers that have the responsibility of offering services aimed at school transformation and school turnaround. The efforts are to be focused on increasing the academic achievement of students and teacher professional development, taking into consideration the specific needs of each school, including the needs of students with disabilities.

The RADs continue offering individualized administrative and academic support to address the specific areas of need for each school. The RADs also continue help schools in planning and implementation of the interventions designed to result in school transformation. Each school community, in cooperation with its assigned external service provider (i.e., its RAD), works to implement the EBP's and other interventions in order to achieve the goals established in the school's intervention plan (which is a component of the school's PCEA). This intervention plan contains and addresses the school's needs and the specific reasons for why the school has been identified as focus.

PRDE understands that in order to obtain the expected results in the ESSA Flexibility and the SSIP, it is important the coordination and teamwork between different units impacting the special education students. For this, the SAEF continues joined forces with the Undersecretary of Academic Affairs and the Yabucoa School District with the goal of carrying out coordinated work to address both Flexibility and the SSIP initiatives. Quarterly meetings/working sessions were coordinated to analyze the planned interventions in the selected schools, along with employees of the school district and the RADs.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Besides working with the district, SAEE also joined forces and has worked together with the RAD's Director in order to assure that the selected schools receive the services that were contracted and that the RAD count with specialized resources to impact special education teachers.

As we mention in the Infrastructure Component, the SAEE also developed a series of improvement strategies in collaboration with different units and offices from PRDE. Among these efforts are:

- During October 2015 the SAEE in coordination with the RAD's Office Director, held meetings island wide. The participants were all the focus schools RAD's, the District Special Assistants and focus schools directors, to provide orientation about the SSIP initiative and the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement, scale-up and sustain the use of EBPs. With the main focus of improving math performance for students with disabilities on elementary focus school in their region.
- As established in our SIMR, that "providing professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the needs assessment". The SAEE in joined efforts with the Yabucoa District and as a continuum of training from the Planning Training provided last year and discussed in Phase I, SAEE offered an orientation for Differentiated Instruction on March 2016. The training was provided by Prof. Felipe Olmeda from special education technical assistance unit on the Central Level. The professor was selected as the resource to provide such training because of his expertise in special education and experience as a Special Education Teacher, School Director, Municipality Facilitator, District Facilitator and Special Education Facilitator at the SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit for a total of 26 years in the public service. The training was design in collaboration with the Yabucoa Math Facilitator, Prof. Elizabeth Rodriguez, who also has a vast experience in this academic subject. As a stakeholder input to evidence the acquisition of knowledge a pre and post-test had to me submitted to the audience. The construction of the pre and post-test was created jointly with various TA Facilitators at the central level to ensure validity of the test. The results of this training will be presented at the Evaluation Component.

As mentioned, PRDE has developed a series of platforms in order to benefit the schools, the district and the central level. With these technology platforms the multiples units and office in the PRDE also can ensure that the steps and the implementation of interventions that are being developed at the school level and district levels occur within the timelines. These new technology platforms are: PCEA Live, SAMA (Support and Academic Monitoring System platform), and RAD.

[1] From the 2015-2016 school year PRDE new system for evaluating students called META-PR, *Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico*. In the evaluation component we explained in detail this change.

[2] Page 45 of the ACSPOG

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Component #3: Evaluation

With the purpose of evaluating the alignment of PRDE's theory of action and other components of the SSIP/ESSA Flexibility, PRDE has established several internal and external evaluation processes. Each evaluation process will be discussed. For your reference, provided below is a brief summary of PRDE's theory of action and SIMR as described in Phase I.

PRDE's State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is aligned to APR Indicator 3C and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the PPAA. Specifically, the SIMR is an increase in the percentage % of special education students from the 6th grade who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools in the Yabucoa School District.

Through the SSIP, PRDE believes that IF it implements the combination of the following interventions (Theory of Action):

- Conducting a school specific needs assessment for serving students with disabilities; (addressed in Phase I)
- Providing professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the needs assessment (in a coordinated fashion between the SAEE, the RADs and the school district);
- Assignment of additional resources such as ensuring a district level special education facilitator is in place as well as those services provided to the school by the RAD (discussed above); and,
- An Academic Monitoring plan carried out by the district to ensure compliance with the ESSA Flexibility and SSIP,

THEN, the result will be in improved performance of students with disabilities taking the PPAA[1] at the participating schools. To illustrate the interrelation between the theory of action with the SSIP evaluation plan, SAEE presents the Logic Model. The Logic Model outlines the short and long term outcomes that will be reached by implementing the coherent improvement strategies, established in Phase I and applied in Phase II.

Inputs	Outputs		Outcomes	
	Strategies	Participation	Short-Term	Long-Term
Professional development for general education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities.	1. Provide professional development for strengthening school leadership, improve teaching, and increase student learning.	1. SAEE	Teachers will have the tools to offer differentiated instructions.	1. Teachers gain in Knowledge
		2. Special Education Facilitators		2. Improved academic achievement of special education
		3. RAD's		

Inputs	Strategies	Participation	Short-Term	Long-Term
	2. Provide Individual Coaching			
	3. Provide Group Coaching			
Strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers.	1. Provide professional development in instructional planning for special ed teachers	1. SAEE 2. District (Math and Special Ed Facilitators)	Special Education teachers will strengthen their academic planning skills	
	2. Provide Individual Coaching	3. RAD's		students
Increase communication between the teacher from the general education classroom and the special education teacher.	1. Provide Group Coaching	1. District	Have better communication between the teacher from the general education classroom and the special education teacher.	3. Reduction in academic gaps between the special education subgroup and all students.
	2. Learning Communities	2. RAD's		
Schools utilizing data based strategies in making educational decisions.	1. Provide professional development (workshops) on Data Driven Decision Making	1. District (Math and Special Ed Facilitators) 2. RAD's	Increase the capacity of schools to use data in decision making	
Have all Special Education Facilitator in the municipalities and the district to support the schools	1. Assignment of resources to support academic management/oversight.	1. SAEE 2. Humacao Region	Increase the TA assistance that the Special Education Facilitator provided to schools	

With the purpose of evaluating the alignment of the theory of action and other components of the SSIP/ESSA Flexibility PRDE has established internal and external evaluation processes. We will discuss first the internal evaluation process. The evaluation process described below comes from ESSA Flexibility, as it directly impacts the subgroups including special education subgroup. Also, it impacts the work performed by the special education teachers and district facilitators.

Internal Evaluation

1. *Accountability System*

As mentioned above, the SIMR impacts the elementary focus schools at the Yabucoa District. It is important to note that each focus school has established a PCEA. Focus school PCEAs emphasize analysis of student need data to determine the interventions necessary to address the achievement gaps that caused the school to be identified as focus. Each school director, in conjunction with their school's PCEA Working Committee, establishes the activities and interventions that the school has developed and/or revised for every school year in order to improve the academic achievement of its students.

As part of the PCEA, each school prepared a School Intervention Plan (PIE). The PIE established strategies and additional interventions that will be implemented in the schools based on the results from the needs assessment and input from the school community, the district and an external service provider (RAD). The PIE contains all subject matter EBPs. For **math**, the participating schools selected the following EBPs to address their individual needs for students with disabilities: concept development, integration of technology in the classroom, curriculum integration, learning communities, and differentiated instruction. Additionally, other strategies that are included in the PIE are: an extended learning time program, job embedded professional development plan, parent and community involvement strategy, and data driven decision making, as discussed in on the second component.

The PCEA presents from each school:

- The achievement of students, personnel, and other resources available for the year, utilizing the available data.
- The analysis of student achievement tendencies, identifying root causes of low academic achievement, and propose strategies for improving student academic achievement.
- Summarizes school professional development needs for specific student subgroups (including special education students) within the school.
- Plan initiatives to involve parents in educational processes of the school and promote strong and effective relationships between families and the school.

School Level

In order for the school to assure compliance with its PCEA they have to create a Planning Committee. This planning committee is composed of a representative of each area and grade of the school and their mayor responsibility is to assure that the PCEA is being implemented in accordance to the

The committee has to meet at least once a month and provide evidence to the district, region and central level. The evidence of the meetings are uploaded at the Platform of the PCEA. The platform requires evidences of these meetings such as: meeting minutes, attendance sheets and agenda in order to accept the meeting as done. The results/report from this meeting has to be aligned with the objectives and strategies goals of the PCEA. At the district level the Academic Superintendent is in charge of monitoring these meetings.

District Level

At the district level, monthly meetings are held with district staff including school directors to ensure the system's ability to meet grade level requirements. During these meetings, the district also facilitates discussions between schools to share best practices and develop intervention strategies. The district level staff provides support through technical assistance to the school director.

The Superintendent of Academic Support is also in charge of monitoring the visits of the academic facilitators. This school year the Yabucoa Academic Superintendent completed a monitoring of the technical assistance visits made from the academic and special education facilitators. From the visits identified, the 85% were related to administrative aspects. The other 15% was related to direct assistance to classroom teacher, which was an identified need. This is an important observation of the evaluation process of the district level that was addressed immediately. To assure the academic support and technical assistance at the school level, the academic superintendent establish an aggressive corrective action plan with the district facilitators. This plan includes monthly meetings to evaluate the interventions of these personnel in the participating schools. At this moment, the percent of direct assistance to the classroom has increased in a 87%.

As part of the requirements of ESSA Flexibility, each district has to complete the Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership (Principle III). This process starts at the school level with the school director who has to meet with all the teachers and evaluate their performance and needs areas. After the meeting with the teacher the school director jointly completes a summary of the intervention required for each teacher. Then, the Superintendent of Academic Support refers the teacher to the academic facilitator in order for them to provide focus technical assistance. Specifically, at the Yabucoa District each academic and special education facilitator has to complete an individual action plan for each referred teacher, which is a cycle of targeted academic technical assistance with a minimum of 2 visits per teacher.

If a teacher has more than six visits and the facilitator establishes that the interventions are no longer effective, the school director initiate the regular teacher evaluation. If the teacher is evaluated as low performing, they have to establish an action plan that contains the activities to address their needs.

Central Level

As we mentioned in the Component 1, in order to support the school's compliance with PRDE's ESSA Flexibility Plan and the SSIP, PRDE has developed a series of platforms that benefit both schools and external suppliers. The Undersecretary of Academic Affairs and the Associate Secretary of Special Education (SAEE) use these platforms RAD and SAMA to ensure and evaluate the implementation of interventions that are being developed at the school and district level.

Is important to establish that at the SAEE the Compliance Officer and all Technical Assistance Facilitator have access to those platforms and continuously monitor the progress of the participating schools. In addition, SAEE working group have regular meetings with the Yabucoa District staff to ensure and evaluate the progress of the district initiatives that impact the participating schools. The SAEE working group is composed by Compliance Officer, SAEEs TA Facilitator, Special Assistant of the Under-secretariat of Academic Affairs and Yabucoa's Academic Superintendent.

External Evaluation

- *External Evaluation at the District Level*

In its initial ESSA Flexibility and as mentioned on the Phase I of the SSIP, PRDE planned to hire an external evaluator to work on evaluating the implementation and effectiveness of PRDE's differentiated system of accountability. The goal for this initiative was to ensure that services were provided to priority, focus, and 5% of schools with the lowest academic achievement in Title I, and those schools that have not been classified yet. However, given PRDE's experience with the implementation of ESSA Flexibility during the 2014-2015 school year, PRDE has decided that the original focus of this services, offered by external evaluators, is no longer appropriate. PRDE has designed and implemented new processes and technological platforms that facilitates the monitoring from the Central level. PRDE has developed these online systems that help ensure that interventions at the school level are: 1) aligned to the needs of the school and 2) implemented with fidelity.

As such, PRDE has changed the scope of the external evaluator to provide technical assistance and management support staff performance at the district level. The external service provider has visited some selected regions and has submitted reports that include an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and recommendations to the central level and / or school district. These reports are submitted to the Secretariat for Academic Affairs and shared with key PRDE areas including SAEE. The selection of the districts to evaluate are made by identifying the ones with more needs, based on the results of the monitoring process made by Office of Academic Affairs in the SAMA platform. This external evaluator has visited various district and has offered technical assistance. This technical assistance is offered by using as a basis the good practices of some districts in those districts that have deficiencies in these same areas, which has been beneficial for them. PRDE SAEE is coordinating with the Office of Academic Affairs the inclusion of the Yabucoa District as part of the visits of the external evaluator.

Through the School Transformation Unit (UTE, by its acronym in Spanish) PRDE has designed an assessment procedure to evaluate the performance of external providers in terms of quality of services in compliance with program requirements. This evaluation process allows for the analysis of the impact of services provided by suppliers and the ability to take appropriate and timely action on the necessary changes required to ensure the effective implementation of the school improvement plan. The provider establishes short- and long-term objectives in order to achieve a positive impact on indicators measuring the progress of schools.

In order to evaluate and monitor providers in priority and focus schools, PRDE developed a request for proposals for selecting an external evaluator to carry out an external evaluation that focuses on assessing compliance with administrative, programmatic and academic priority areas.

- *Evaluations of External Providers (RAD)*

PRDE's criteria for evaluating external suppliers was developed using the Guide to Work with External Providers (Learning Point, 2010). PRDE used this guide to create a conceptual framework to involve, manage and evaluate external providers. The providers are evaluated using the following criteria:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Whether the Provider understands PRDE's needs and their ability to align products and services with these specific needs.
- The proven success of the provider to achieve positive impacts in the process of teaching and learning.
- The extent to which professional development from the provider is based on scientific research and its alignment with the academic, curricular and academic goals of PRDE.
- The extent to which the providers products and services can be customized.
- The ability of the provider to demonstrate how professional development activities are part of a long-term strategy to improve teaching and learning.
- The provider's ability to focus on specific content that teachers need in order to teach and students need in order to learn
- The provider's ability to link academic strategies based on scientific research that addresses specific challenges identified by schools
- The extent to which service providers are aligned with other major initiatives currently under development at PRDE and the degree to which the provider's services support the services currently offered by the staff from PRDE

The goal of this evaluation system is to promote continuous improvement and enable the development of internal capacity related to the selection and supervision of service providers. The supplier evaluation is aligned with PRDE's broader accountability system (i.e. assessment results, graduation rates) but also includes intermediate measures of progress. These intermediate indicators indicate the degree to which the services are required and if annual academic achievement goals are being met.

On December 2015, PRDE released a memorandum titled "Visits for the external evaluations of the RADs". Through the memo PRDE notifies to the academic community that an external evaluator has been contracted to perform visits to the schools that receive RAD services such as, priority No-SIG, and focus schools. The visits have the main purpose to evaluate the services provided to the schools by the RADs. From the total of 195 schools that received such services, a representative sample of 74 schools has been selected randomly. Regarding to the Yabucoa District, considering the SSIP initiative, two of our participating schools were part of that sample. The schools are: María T. Delgado and Eugenio M. de Hostos. Both schools were visited on March 14, 2016. The evaluation includes the following process: interview to the school director, teachers, parents, and RAD personnel; observation of process in the classroom and different types of surveys. PRDE has requested the preliminary report by the end of the visit cycle.

Additional methods for evaluating the performance and services from the providers includes an online questionnaire to school staff so they may provide their feedback. An example of the questions are:

- Were there any problems during implementation?
- Did the supplier establish and maintain a good relationship with the school and district?
- Did the provider deliver services as expected?
- Was there a gap between the needs of the school and provider services?
- Were there any logistical challenges? If there was, was it resolved quickly and efficiently?
- Did the service provider align to content standards and assessment practices provided by PRDE?
- Did the service provider come into conflict with some of the local requirements?
- Did the supplier participate in a continuous and open communication with all relevant stakeholders?
- Did the supplier respond to concerns / conflicts in a timely manner and efficiently?

Specifically, for the Yabucoa District RAD questionnaire all schools participating on our SIMR have reported satisfaction with the performance and services provided by the external supplier. As a result, this evaluation is part of the criteria to consider the extension of the supplier's contract.

PRDE pretends to use internal evaluation processes as a short-term option to identify achievements and areas of needs, allowing to address them promptly. Moreover, the evaluation that is made by external providers wants as a long-term, to validate that the different levels of support from PRDE through the RADs, have been implementing strategies aligned to the standards and expectations previously established and demonstrate improvement in the achievement of all students.

SAEE's Analysis

PRDE SAEE, in order to evaluate the SSIP's selected improvement strategies, created an instrument which includes the interventions received by the selected focus schools from the different entities that are providing support and/or technical assistance. This instrument is nourished from different tools developed by PRDE, mentioned previously in this section. Among which are the following, SAMA, PCEA, RAD, district working sessions and interventions made by the SAEE. This evaluation process, also includes, the growth in student's achievement between the 10 and 20 weeks of classes. This instrument was approved by the stakeholder group, who also recommended that it may be carried out by the SAEE working group.

This exercise is done previous to the evaluation of the PPAA results, in order to monitor every 10 weeks the achievement of the students of the participating schools. PRDE SAEE plan to do this evaluation 2 times a year. First, comparing the results of the 10 and 20 weeks. And at the end of the school year using the results of the 30 and 40 weeks.

In the graph below, will be presented the results of the analysis of the students scoring in their grades "As, B's or C's" in math.

The results in the evaluation of students with disabilities from the participating schools shows for 4th grade an improvement of 5% in the 20 weeks. For 5th grade it shows a progress of 1% and for the 6th grade demonstrate a decrease of 2%. This reduction in the academic progress was identified in two of the participating schools, which are Jorge Rosario del Valle and SU Isidro Vicens (Quebrada Honda). To address the particular needs of these two schools the SAEE and the Yabucoa District determined to increase the technical assistance provided from the district to identify their needs and establish the strategies that will impact their progress.

As a recommendation from our stakeholder group and part of our evaluation process the SAEE evaluated the professional development titled "Differentiated Instruction for Students with Disabilities". As mentioned in component #2, our SIMR establishes that "providing professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the needs assessment". It is important to note that the facilitators that provided the orientation are highly qualified. The assistance of teachers from special education, math, and school directors was perfect. To measure the knowledge acquired a pre and post-test was submitted to the participants. Also, a satisfaction questionnaire was utilized to measure their complacency with the training. Below will be discussed in first-hand the results of the pre and post-test and after will be discussed the results of the satisfaction questionnaire.

Summary of the pre and post test results:

From the satisfaction questionnaire it can be concluded that the instructor demonstrated mastery on the subject and considered that the information prepared

them for their personal and professional development.

The following objective was achieved at the training the differentiated instruction as part of the public policy of the PRDE, is considered as an educational strategy, with usefulness in teaching and the learning process for students with disabilities.

SAEE and SSIP stakeholder group can conclude that the constant communication and monitoring of the Yabucoa District has impacted significantly the performance of the academic and special education facilitators focusing the provision of their technical assistance on academic aspects and visits to the classroom. Also, they have impacted the RADs, assuring that the implementation of all the initiatives are taking place in a coordinated manner and as establish in PRDEs ESSA Flexibility and SSIP. This has been, based on SAEEs evaluation, the key to having surpassed the goal of our SIMR. The function of the district of overseeing the new transforming vision of PRDE has been beneficial to the SSIP and for the implementation of the ESSA Flexibility. Also, addressing the district need of having a special education facilitator in place, has strengthen the technical assistance provided to the schools, which is beneficial for the students.

Given that the results of the evaluation were satisfactory, the SAEE sees no need to make major changes or modifications to the SSIP for this phase. However, considering the changes that will occur by the restructuring of PRDE (during the next school year 2016-2017), if necessary to make changes to the SIMR, the SAEE undoubtedly will discuss with the stakeholders so that the changes will be made taking into account the best interests of our students.

Changes in Puerto Rico Assessment from PPAA to META-PR

The evaluation process of students is integral and necessary to ensure the quality and effectiveness of educational processes taught in school. The proper use and interpretation of the evaluation process contributes significantly to improve student learning. Given this, and as part of the restructuring and academic transformation with longitudinal view, DEPR has instituted the test called META-PR, *Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico* as the new system for evaluating students. The previous system the PPAA, was one of accountability based on the proficiency of students. This new system META-PR, is a multilevel system of support and accountability. META-PR academic achievement is measured in the areas of Spanish, Math, English as a second language and science. These tests are aligned with the fundamental concepts and skills contained in the Standards and Expectations Grade 2014, established by the DEPR. The results of META-PR will allow the Department to implement effective and relevant pedagogical decisions that help improve our students authentic learning.

As part of this new evaluation system, the DEPR convert the result that students obtain in META-PR assessment in another grade that will be included in the final academic progress report for each student. For this year, only Spanish will be include in the final report as a pilot project. Starting next school Math would be included as a pilot project. Each subsequent year a new course would be added.

Stakeholder Involvement (Family and Community Involvement)

Family and community involvement has historically been a challenge for the PRDE due in part to the passive role these two stakeholders have played in the past. Over the past two years, the participation of families and communities at the school level has become a priority. In 2013 the PRDE has issued several administrative policies to encourage parental and community member involvement such as the Curricular Letter # 15 from 2013-2014 published in July 20, 2013. PRDE use the National Standards for Parent Involvement, based on the model of Joyce Epstein (2001) as a guide. This model includes six standard collaborations between families, schools and community. These include: facilitating the proactive participation of parents and the community to strengthen the integration of parents and the community in the decision-making process; establish alliances and relationships with schools that will benefit students, among others. Current PRDE policies support the implementation of PRDE ESSAs Flexibility as it prioritizes the participation of the parents of special education students and LLE students.

At school level the PRDE disseminate information about ESSA flexibility and gather feedback from stakeholders through the school councils. After performing an event with parents and community members, school directors send information describing the event and reporting a summary of the feedback received to the District Special Assistant and at the same time they send the information to the Central Level. (No significant suggestions have been received)

For students with disabilities, the Special Education Services Center (CSEE), released information about the ESSA Flexibility Plan and SSIP to parent's island wide. This strategy has been particularly effective because CSEE is already a resource that parents regularly use. At the Center, parents are given access to all information and can make recommendations or comments. Additionally, there were monthly parent meetings for those who visited CSEE. At these meetings, parents receive information and have the opportunity to ask questions and clarify any issues or concerns. Parent feedback collected during these meetings was shared with the SAEE at Central Level and at the same time the SAEE personnel share this information with the Office of Academic Affairs.

In addition to the meetings in the CSEE, the Associate Secretary of Special Education has been meeting with various groups of special education students' parents to share information about the ESSA Flexibility and SSIP. Specifically, there was a meeting between the Associate Secretary, the parents of the Committee of Special Education, the Special Education Advisory Committee (CCEE) and the APNI (Support for Parents of Disabled Children).

As we previously mentioned, PRDE uses a standard platform for PCEAs, which assists and guides schools with the development of their PCEAs. Various stakeholders were involved in the process of updating the design and platform used by schools to create their PCEA. During this process PRDE received feedback, questions and suggestions that were incorporated into the final design of the PCEA. There have been extensive discussions with stakeholders regarding how schools complying with all indicators, except significant gaps, can change their classification. The Under Secretariat for Academic Affairs and the Auxiliary Secretary of Transformation, Planning and Performance have considered the recommendations of school administrators in developing workshops and establishing the adequate changes in the documents to support and respond to the needs of stakeholders.

As mentioned in the introduction, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with its stakeholder group and received their input regarding all three Phase II SSIP components, which includes the evaluation processes. The stakeholder group for the Phase II was composed including: Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa School District, Special Assistants/Compliance Officers, ESSA Waiver Coordinator (Flexibility), SAEE Special Education Academic Facilitators, parents of students with disabilities and relevant consultants. For identification of the instruments to be used as part of the evaluation process, the stakeholder's participation was essential. As mentioned before, the stakeholder was part of the design of our instrument to evaluate the SSIP. They also, collaborated in the analysis made of the results of the PRDE's regular assessment and also the comparison of the growth on student's achievement on the 10 and 20 weeks of classes.

[1] As previously mentioned, from the 2015-2016 school year PRDE new system for evaluating students called META-PR, *Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico*. In the evaluation component we explained in detail this change.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Technical Assistance and Support

PRDE has determined the better use of its existing resources. With this in mind it was determined as a stakeholder input that the alignment with the ESSA Flexibility was necessary to combine the efforts of the SAEE and the Under-secretariat of Academic Affairs. Even though grate input has been received from the stakeholder group, the SAEE identified as a barrier the stakeholder involvement in the development of Phase II. Trying to meet all the group together and focusing the meetings was difficult. This is why the SAEE would like assistance on strategies to better involve stakeholders.

The support that PRDE has received from OSEP on clarifying doubts and being available at any time has been very beneficial. Also a key point in our accomplishment has been the technical assistance of NCSI members as such Katherine Bradley and Pakethia Harris for the development of the PRDE logic model, in the evaluation process and the elaboration on the Component #2 EBP's for math. The math collaborative have helped in recognizing other States with the same needs as PR and using these States experience as reference. SAEE would like to continue with the technical assistance received as it has shown to be effective. We understand that in order to be effective and successful in Phase III this technical assistance would be significant on the on-going evaluation process.

Also, as soon as the Phases of the restructuring of PRDE are fully implemented for next school year, SAEE will evaluate the impact at the school level. When SAEE acknowledges the complete information on how they could affect the participating schools would be beneficial to receive technical assistance on how to manage the impact on the Phase III of the SSIP.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Introduction

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE), presents its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III year 3 with the purpose of improving child-level outcomes for students with disabilities. These efforts were aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Education Act (IDEIA) and the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). As presented during previous phases, PRDE along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the Puerto Rico Assessment system called META-PR, (*Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico*), in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region.

After a broad analysis during the Phase I, PRDE along with the stakeholder group selected that the SSIP would begin with a focus on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR^[1] in mathematics within the Yabucoa District. PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa District. However, PRDE modified its SiMR in 2016-2017 to adjust to public policy changes related to elementary grade levels, changing from kindergarten to grade 6 to now only kindergarten through grade 5. After a data analysis, and discussion with the stakeholder group, the determination was made to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities on the PR Assessment (META) from the participating schools in the Yabucoa District.

Since the beginning, stakeholders have been very involved in decision-making regarding the discussion of the data, the selection of the new SiMR grade-level focus and have been involved in the SSIP implementation process. Stakeholder, specifically educators leaders such as Academic Superintendent of the Yabucoa School District, PRDE Director of the Mathematics Program, a School Director, and a Special Education Teacher, also participated on the selection of the coherent improvement strategies for all PRDE levels. Through ongoing stakeholder meetings activities done at the district, school level and the support provided by the Differentiated Support Network (RAD by its acronym in Spanish), for the implementation of the SSIP. The meetings with the stakeholders are ongoing, at least once monthly and have become increasingly more meaningful as they acquire more knowledge on the SSIP. As a result, the stakeholders for Phase III year 3, are more knowledgeable of the development of the SSIP and have provided better feedback.

As we mentioned in last year's submission, various factors impacted the implementation of the SSIP during FFY 2017. The ESSA Plan of Puerto Rico was submitted to the Federal Government in September 2017 and approved in January 2018. It establishes important aspects of the public education policy of Puerto Rico and replaces the Transformation Plan with Longitudinal Vision. The ESSA Plan of Puerto Rico is a new model of accountability that seeks to generate better results and greater transparency in the educational system of Puerto Rico. Another aspect that had a significant impact on the 2017 SSIP implementation were hurricanes Irma and Maria during September 2017. On September 4, 2017, hurricane Irma impacted the Island, and as a result, approximately 800 households were without electricity. Two weeks later, on September 20, 2017, hurricane Maria made landfall on the island of Puerto Rico as a high-end Category 4, nearly Category 5, hurricane with winds of 175-190 mph. The eye of the hurricane entered the island through Yabucoa in the Region of Humacao on the eastern side of the Island, where our SSIP is being executed, and thus had a direct impact in the SSIP implementation. Flooding affected all of Puerto Rico, with water levels reaching as high as six feet in some areas and numerous buildings losing their roofs. Hurricane Maria significantly damaged infrastructure, disabling radar and cell towers, severely impacting communications within the island, and completely knocking out electricity. The electricity slowly started coming back in late November 2017, two months after the hurricanes, and power was established in more than 70% of the island by late February 2018.

In the aftermath of hurricane Maria, a large number of PRDE public schools served as shelters for families and individuals. This saved the lives of those Puerto Ricans whose homes were not safe or inhabitable. Schools were serving not only as shelters but also as community points of access for food, health clinics, and as centers for children. Additionally, several schools were closed and unable to serve these key roles for their communities following the hurricanes due to the significant levels of damages to their structure. It was over a month after hurricane Maria, that the first group of PRDE schools officially re-opened to once again provide academic services. A total of 119 schools, just 11% of PRDE schools that existed at the start of the 2017-2018 school year, re-opened on October 23, 2017. PRDE continued to re-open schools as aggressively as safely possible. By November 7, 2017, PRDE had been able to re-open approximately half of the schools that existed at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year. The last schools to re-open were from the Humacao Region, on December 14, 2017, nearly two months after the Hurricane made landfall in Puerto Rico. A total of approximately 20 schools that existed at the start of the 2017-2018 school year never re-opened due to severe damages as a result of the hurricanes. Throughout the report, how those factors impacted the SSIP implementation will be presented in detail. Specifically, on page 11, Progress of the Implementation area we will discuss how the hurricanes affected the SSIP schools.

[1] PRDE changed its statewide Assessment, formerly called PPAA, and since has instituted the test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico.

I. Summary of Phase 3 Year 3

A. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.

PRDE's Theory of Action was established during phase I. As we described in the Phase I submission, Stakeholders were involved in the development of the Theory of Action. Multiple meetings were held with the Stakeholder Group where the specific needs assessment study conducted by PRDE central level were discussed and the principal roots cause or assumptions of the low academic achievement were identified. Then the group discussed and proposed the strategies for improving student academic achievement. Figure 1 shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies described throughout this document will lead to achievement of improved results for children with disabilities. PRDE's Theory of Action is presented as follows:

PRDE believes that if it implements the combination of the following interventions:

- Conducting a school specific needs assessment study for serving students with disabilities;
- Providing professional development in mathematics for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the need's assessment study (in a coordinated way between the SAEE, the RADs and the school district);
- Assignment of additional resources such as ensuring a district level special education facilitator is in place as well as those services provided to the school by the RAD (discussed above); and,
- An Academic Monitoring Plan carried out by the district to ensure compliance with the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan,

THEN, the result will be an improved performance of fifth-grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR at the participating schools. As such, with the interventions being implemented in 3rd through 5th grade, those teachers receiving more professional development will improve the quality of the teaching in their classroom. This will directly impact the proficiency of their students. As such, stakeholders believe this theory of action has a high likelihood of leading to a measurable improvement in mathematics scores for fifth grade students with disabilities.

The below graphic illustration shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies described throughout this document will lead to achievement of improved results for children with disabilities.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Figure 1: Theory of Action

Please refer to attached report to see figure 1

A.1 State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)

PRDE's State-identified measurable Results (SIMR) is to increase the percentage (%) of special education students in the 5th grade who score proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math in the selected elementary schools from the Yabucoa School District. PRDE's SIMR is aligned in accordance to APR Indicator 3C and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment System, called *Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico (META-PR)*. Table 1 shows the SSIP schools that currently serve a total of 58 students in special education, receiving math instruction within general education.

Table 1: Participating Schools in the SSIP during FFY 2017

Region	District	Municipality	Schools	Schools Grade Levels
		Maunabo	Calzada	K - 5
		San Lorenzo	Dra. María T. Delgado de Marciano	K - 8
		San Lorenzo	Eugenio María de Hostos	K - 5
Humacao	Yabucoa	San Lorenzo	Jorge Rosario del Valle	PK - 8
		San Lorenzo	Luis Muñoz Rivera	PK - 5
		Patillas	Marín Bajo	K - 5
		San Lorenzo	SU Isidro Vicens	PK - 8

B. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies

PRDE central level conducted a school specific needs assessment study for serving students with disabilities by interviewing general and special education teachers, and school directors during the first year of the SSIP (2013-2014). This study was conducted at each participating SSIP school. As a result, the identified needs led to the establishment of the inputs of the Logic Model, presented in Phase II. The *logic model outlines the short and long term outcomes that will be reached by implementing the coherent improvement strategies*. See table 2 below.

Table 2: PRDE's SSIP Logic Model

Inputs	Outputs		Outcomes	
	Strategies	Participation	Short-Term	Long-Term
Professional development for general education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities.	1. Provide professional development for strengthening school leadership, improve teaching, and increase student learning.	- SAEE - Special Education Facilitators	Teachers will have the tools to offer differentiated instructions	
	2. Provide Individual Coaching	-RAD's		
	3. Provide Group Coaching			
Strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers.	1. Provide professional development in instructional planning for special ed teachers	- SAEE - District (Math and Special Ed Facilitators)	Special Education teachers will strengthen their academic planning skills	Ø Teachers gain in Knowledge
	2. Provide Individual Coaching	-RAD's		Ø Improved academic achievement of special education students
Increase communication between the teacher from the general education classroom and the special education teacher.	1. Provide Group Coaching	- District	Have better communication between the teacher from the general education classroom and the special education teacher.	Ø Reduction in academic gaps between the special education subgroup and all students.
	2. Learning Communities	-RAD's		
Schools utilizing data based strategies in making educational decisions.	1. Provide professional development (workshops) on Data Driven Decision Making	- District (Math and Special Ed Facilitators) -RAD's	Increase the capacity of schools to use data in decision making	
Have all Special Education Facilitator in the municipalities and the district to support the	1. Assignment of resources to support academic management/oversight.	- SAEE - Humacao Region	Increase the TA assistance that the Special Education Facilitator provided to	

Inputs	Outputs		Outcomes	
	Strategies	Participation	Short-Term	Long-Term
schools			schools	

The logic model has served as a basis for establishing the strategies implemented during the different SSIP phases. Related to these strategies during the 2017-2018 school year, and as mentioned in the introduction, Puerto Rico has faced unique challenges. The eye of hurricane María entered the island through Yabucoa, where our SSIP is being implemented. Even though the hurricanes directly impacted the SSIP schools, we present the strategies employed during this school year:

Professional development for teachers who served students with disabilities - PRDE continued to partner with external providers, known as Differentiated Support Network (Red de Apoyo Diferenciado or RAD by its acronym in Spanish). The RADs continued offering administrative and academic support individualized to address the specific areas of need for each school. The RADs also continued offering professional development services such as workshops and coaching to schools throughout the academic school year. At the school level, each school also provided professional development activities for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in their need's assessment study.

- > Strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers – The RADs also continued helping schools in planning and implementation of the interventions designed to result in school transformation. As part of the coaching service provided by the RAD, the coaches worked on the topic: Planning of teaching including math (writing objectives, developing performance tasks among others).
- > Increase communication between general education teachers and special education teachers – As mentioned in previous phases, PRDE continued with the initiative of professional learning communities. These communities are known as the Eclectic Model of Professional Learning Communities (MECPA by its acronym in Spanish).

> Schools using data-based strategies in making educational decisions - Two professional development activities regarding use of data-based strategies were provided by the RAD during FFY 2017. Specifically, the topics were:

1. Analysis of Progress Indicators META-PR and students grades (A, B, C's) for Decision Making
2. Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL

Also, as part of the coaching service provided by the RAD, the coaches worked on the topic: Assist the teacher with the analysis of students data to implement interventions based on effective strategies according to data analysis.

- > Have all Special Education Facilitators in the municipalities and the district to support the schools - All the Special Ed Facilitator positions in the School District of Yabucoa, including the four municipalities, were filled. This effort has been sustained through the SSIP Phases I, II and III (year 1 to 3) of implementation.

Because of the impact of the Hurricane Maria in the Humacao Region, PRDE conducted a new school specific assessment (during 2017-2018) to be addressed during the 2018-2019 school year, with the school directors of the participating schools. This was done with the purpose of identifying the possible new needs of the schools. With this assessment the school directors had the opportunity to present the strengths and weaknesses of their math and special education teachers and provide ideas on the ways PRDE can offer assistance to support these teachers and their needs. The school directors concurred and indicated that the teachers needed: individual coaching, demonstrative classes including the use of Evidence Based Practices (EBP's) in math, workshops (with practice exercises) and TA on data-driven decision making.

B.1 Other PRDE Initiatives implemented during 2017-2018 school year that impacted SSIP

As part of other initiatives, PRDE seeks to manage inappropriate behaviors that affect school climate, to foster an environment conducive to learning and to increase student achievement. As part of the PRDE Consolidated State Plan2, to improve school climate, PRDE implemented a Professional Development Program for supervisors, teachers and school's directors of elementary schools in order for them to properly implement the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support System (PBIS), including the elementary schools of the Yabucoa Districts. PBIS is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students.

During the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE implemented another strategy, Response to Intervention (RTI), in the Humacao Region (the same region in which the SSIP is being implemented) as a pilot project. Through the implementation of the RTI framework, the PRDE seeks to improve the academic achievement of all students, including students with disabilities or special needs, who are at risk of not reaching goals and expectations of the degree they are studying. The RTI initiative has the focus of the school as a model to identify and provide instruction and early intervention for all students who perform below the parameters expected by the PRDE in the subjects of Spanish and Mathematics. The activities carried out as part of the initiative during the year 2017 included seminars, workshops, coaching and demonstration classes on RTI to school and leadership staff of all schools in the Humacao Region.

C. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date

During Phase II, the selected Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed. As mentioned in the previous phases, PRDE established a guide that contains the definition and the Evidence Based Practices (EBP) adopted by the state. These EBPs "are based on scientific research", which means that when possible, the educational interventions being used must be strongly supported by evidence from well-conducted research studies. Strategies selected should be those that strengthen academic programs, increase the amount and quality of instructional time, and address the particular needs of the students.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This guide contains the six criteria needed to comply as an EBP to be implemented in PRDE. The six criteria are:

- systematic empirical methods,
- rigorous data analysis,
- based on measurement that provides valid and replicable evidence,
- experimental or quasi-experimental research designs,
- studies are clearly detailed for them to be easily replicable and
- reviewed and accepted by independent experts.

For math, which is our focus in the SIMR, PRDE established the following EBPs to address the individual needs for students with disabilities: concept development, integration of technology, contextualized instruction, problem-based learning (PBL), curriculum integration and research in action, differentiated instruction and focus on problem-solving. Other strategies that were used by the schools are: an extended learning time program, job embedded professional development plan, parent and community involvement strategy, coaching and data driven decision making.

At the school level, the EBPs that the school will implement are established in the School Improvement Plan (DEE, per its acronym in Spanish)³. In this plan the school establishes the activities and interventions that will be developing during the school year in order to improve the academic achievement of its students.

One of the main strategies used by PRDE based on its ESSA Plan as part of PRDE's EBPs in its implementation of the SSIP is professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that will be sure to address concerns identified in the schools needs assessment. These professional development activities are designed to provide educators with evidence-based tools and resources that promote effective instruction. In the 2017-2018 school year, special emphasis was placed on differentiated instruction, use of technology and project-based learning. The knowledge and skills gained through these opportunities will strengthen the quality of the teaching and learning process in the classroom to result in improved student achievement. These professional development activities are focused on educators' and students' specific needs to improve student academic achievement. As a result, PRDE expects increases in student performance, as evidenced by results of the state assessment. To ensure the implementation of best practices, PRDE has provided professional development, mentoring, coaching, communities of practice, and data analysis activities.

Another EBP identified by PRDE for all subjects is coaching. This strategy is used to reinforce the skills and knowledge of teachers to improve the teaching-learning process. It is implemented through the support of the external supplier or RAD. Each RAD has coaches who have the expertise to provide instruction by core subject area, including mathematics and special education. Some of the activities given by the RAD are:

- Visits to the special education teacher to provide coaching regarding the use of standards, and curricular framework.
- Coaching to the school director to strengthen didactic leadership and deepen their knowledge of the curriculum frameworks of academic programs and the use of data for decision making.
- Assist the teacher in the design of varied assessment methods based on public policy and performance tasks.
- The provision of Group Coaching to support teachers in the development of practice exercises on a continuous basis so that students have the experiences of content related to the mechanics of the assessment tool. It is also a way for teachers to be better connected as they share information amongst participants; share knowledge and experiences.
- Coaching to the Math Teacher in order to reinforce the understanding and application of academic standards, the use of curricular frameworks and curricular materials to develop an effective teaching-learning process.

It is important to mention that as part of the Coaching process, the RADs conduct follow-up visits with the purpose of ensuring the implementation of the strategies or tools provided to the teachers during the initial visit are been used with fidelity.

D. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes

Establishing an evaluation matrix is the biggest challenge for PRDE since the initial Phase II submission. However, during 2017-2018 school year, PRDE integrated different evaluation components to gauge the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies. The first component is the PRDE Assessment (META-PR), which is used to measure the SIMR proposed target. Annually, Puerto Rico administers META-PR to measure the proficiency and academic growth of students in the content areas of Spanish, math and English as a second language in third through eighth and eleventh grade. The results of PRDE's evaluation system are used to guarantee the accountability and provide support and feedback to schools on student achievement in relation to the curriculum. Through the development of standards and assessment PRDE ensures that all students have access to high-quality education.

In 2015, as a result of the changes previously mentioned in this report, PRDE had to establish a new baseline and new targets. The analysis of data shows that PRDE met its targets for FFY 2016 and 2017. Table 3 reflects SAAE's SIMR baseline data for (FFY 2015) and targets for FFY 2016-2018.

Table 3: PRDE SSIP Baseline Data

Data 27.63%

Table 4: FFY 2016- FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	27.6%	28.1%	28.6%
Data	30.6%	30.8%	

Description of Measure -

A formula is used to calculate the percent of proficiency. The formula is:

Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled in fifth grade at the selected schools scoring advanced or proficient against grade level) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled in fifth grade at the selected schools who received a valid score on the META-PR and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and calculated for math)].

- Advanced (4) - Students at this level show an optimal academic performance in the subject assessed in META-PR and demonstrate a profound level of understanding and conceptual reasoning, as well as the development of skills that are, in both cases, complex and abstract.
- Proficient (3) - Students at this level show competent academic performance in the subject that is assessed in META-PR and demonstrate a significant level of conceptual understanding and reasoning, as well as skill development.

The proficiency rate includes all children with IEPs enrolled during that academic year.

Another component of the evaluation plan and an additional data source used to measure progress toward the SIMR is the student's progress report issued every 10 weeks. The academic progress of the students provides information on the individual growth. This gives the opportunity to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions provided and identify any deficiencies. Further discussion of this data source will be described in more detail in Section V, Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements.

One of the improvement strategies, mentioned in all Phases, was to provide professional development for both general education math teachers and special education teachers. This activity addressed the teachers needs to apply properly differentiated education as a strategy to impact their students with disabilities. To measure the knowledge acquired by the teachers, a pre- and post-test was submitted to the participants. In Section III, Data on Implementation and Outcomes, we discuss the results of the pre- and post-test of each professional development activity realized during this year. In this section we also presented the summary of the domain of the pre and post test of mathematics of the extended learning time program and the evaluation of the coaching services.

To evaluate the services provided by the RAD, PRDE contracted a private company to carry out an external evaluation. This with the purpose of assessing the fidelity of implementation of their work. This exercise evaluated and explored the programmatic and administrative compliance with the implementation arrangements of the RAD program. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the service providers (RADs) and school directors, focus groups with teachers and parents. The external evaluation included parent interviews and administration of questionnaires to teachers, parents, and students.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies implemented as part of the SSIP in the performance and execution of the teachers, we decided to use the results of the evaluations made to the third, fourth and fifth grade teachers at the SSIP schools conducted through the PRDE Teacher Evaluation System. This system has strengthened the process of annually identifying effective teachers and provides a support system to increase the teacher's professional skills, knowledge and effectiveness. In the 2017-2018 academic year, as part of the ESSA Consolidated State Plan, PRDE had reviewed the Teacher Evaluation process. It is a three-step process consisting of two visits from the school director and then the evaluation, which documents, through observation, the areas of strength and opportunity of the teacher, as well as the next steps to receive academic support and technical assistance. Through this system, PRDE seeks to use the results of the formative evaluation results to analyze, plan and improve educational practice. This way PRDE can formalize the efforts and support that will be offered to teachers to make changes in their professional practice to benefit all students. The Teacher Evaluation System is designed to ensure the continuing professional development of educators and to enrich the quality of teaching in schools and student learning.

The system has been designed to provide fair and uniform evaluations offering valuable information regarding professional growth needs to develop professional development opportunities for both effective and less effective teachers that will result in improved student achievement. The outcome data related to the results of the Teacher Evaluation process is presented in the Section 3, Data on Implementation and Outcomes.

E. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies

Since the submission of Phase I, PRDE has made changes to the educational infrastructure, explained in previous SSIP submissions. As a result of the decreased student enrollment figures, in 2017-2018 PRDE decided to close around 200 schools around the island, consolidating them with other schools within the same municipality. As mentioned in last year's report, during 2017-2018 school year the, Quemados School was consolidated in to the Luis Munoz Rivera School, reducing the number of participating schools to 7. This did not affect the number of students impacted by the initiative since they became part of the enrollment of students from another SSIP participating school.

After the passage of hurricanes Irma and María during the month of September 2017, due to the damage caused to the structures and the lack of basic services, many families decided to leave the island moving to the United States. This resulted in a reduction in the number of students impacted by the SSIP during 2017-18 compared to previous years.

During the 2017-2018 school year ESSA Plan of Puerto Rico was submitted to the federal government and approved. It establishes important aspects of the public education policy of Puerto Rico and replaces the Transformation Plan with longitudinal vision. The ESSA Plan of Puerto Rico is a new model of accountability that seeks to generate better results and greater transparency in the educational system of Puerto Rico. Under this Plan, three types of schools are established: "Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)"; "Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)"; and "Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)". Under this Plan, the type of interventions that will be carried out in these schools (CSI, ATSI and TSI) is established, as is a new model for teacher evaluation, among other changes. PRDE is working on revising strategies and evaluation components to ensure that the SSIP is aligned to the ESSA Plan.

Finally, in 2018, PRDE established a new administrative structure, which eliminates the previously existing 28 School Districts, but maintains and works to strengthen the seven previously existing educational regions, which are based on geography. The regions are headquartered at the seven Educational Regional Offices (OREs by its acronym in Spanish): Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Humacao, Mayagüez, Ponce, and San Juan. Each Regional Office is composed of the following positions and units:

- Regional Director is in charge of all matters of the ORE and responds to the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education and Associate Secretary for Special Education.
- Chief Academic Officer is in charge of all Academic Facilitators (including academic facilitators for Special Education), school improvement, academic support, basic curriculum: Spanish, English, Math, and Science. Also, they are in charge of the complementary curriculum, for example: Social Studies, Health, Physical Education, Arts, Vocational Studies and Special Education.
- Student Services Officer is in charge of the direct services for students and social support such as: counselors, nurses and social workers.
- Student Services Unit also oversees the adult education program, at-risk students' education, and special education (including the corresponding Special Education Service Centers).
- School Officer is in charge of providing support to the School Directors, i.e., Principals.
- Accountability Unit is responsible for work related to the Puerto Rico Academic Assessments, Monitoring, and Data Coaching.
- Chief Operating Officer is responsible for federal funds, fiscal issues, and information systems.
- Auxiliary Services oversees the school cafeterias, school maintenance, all school transportation, security and others. Human Resources personnel hiring, professional development and personnel evaluation.
- Legal Division Unit oversees and manages legal issues and complaints, including and special education complaints.

Is important to note that these changes did not have a direct impact in the implementation of the SSIP during 2017.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and 4/15/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.

2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

A. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress

During 2017-2018 PRDE was not able to accomplish all of its planned activities as a result of hurricane Irma and Maria entering the island through Yabucoa in the Region of Humacao on the eastern side of the Island, where our SSIP is being executed. Consequently, many SSIP schools had to be used as shelters. Around 40,000 residents of Yabucoa had no electricity or communication. The damage in Yabucoa was of such magnitude that still in the mid-October of 2017, there was scarcity of water and food. As of June 12, 2018, 9 months after the passage of the Hurricanes, more than 30% of Yabucoa residents were still without electrical power.

As also mentioned in the introduction, several schools were closed and unable to serve key roles for their communities following the hurricanes due to the significant levels of damages to their structure. PRDE continued to re-open schools as aggressively as safely possible. Specifically related to the seven SSIP schools officially re-opened between November and December 2017. The last school to re-open was Luis M. Rivera, on December 14, 2017, nearly two months after the Hurricane made landfall in Puerto Rico. The table below provides information on the dates in which each of the participating schools of the SSIP, re-opened after hurricane Maria. This provides a perspective of the school time that was lost.

Table 5: Dates in which each of the participating schools of the SSIP re-opened after Hurricane Maria

School	Date Opened	Days
1. Maria T. Delgado		
2. Jorge Rosario Del Valle	11/6/2017	47
3. SU Isidro Vicens		
4. Eugenio Ma De Hostos	11/10/2017	51
5. Calzada	11/17/2017	58
6. Marin Abajo	11/21/2017	62
7. Luis M. Rivera	12/14/2017	85

As a result of the foregoing, it was not possible for the SAE to implement all the planned strategies because of the time that was taken away from the 2017-18 school year to open the participating schools, so PRDE's priority was to provide educational and related services to special education students. However, PRDE continued to partner with external providers, RADs (Differentiated Support Network). The RADs continued offering administrative and academic support individualized to address the specific areas of need for each school. Through the RAD, PRDE was able to continue with the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies. These strategies are:

1. Professional development activities for teachers who served students with disabilities-

During FFY 2017, the RADs continued to offer professional development to the impacted schools. The professional development activities offered by the RAD were based on the need's studies carried out by the schools. During 2017 the RAD carried out the following workshops as part of the professional development activities:

- > Project Based Learning
- > Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL
- > Analysis of Progress Indicators for Decision Making

At the school level, PRDE also provided professional development activities for both general and special education teachers. Some of the workshops provided in the participating schools were:

- > Eugenio María de Hostos School - Differentiated instruction as an educational strategy to improve academic achievement by attending to the needs of all students
- > Quebrada Honda School - The ABCs as a teaching and curricular integration strategy
- > Calzada School - Project-based learning as an educational strategy to improve student academic achievement

2. Strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers – During the 2017-2018 school year, the RAD also continued helping schools in planning and implementation of the interventions designed to result in school transformation. As part of the coaching service provided by the RAD, the coaches worked on the topic: Planning of teaching (writing objectives, developing performance tasks among others).

3. Increase communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education - To increase communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education, PRDE developed professional learning communities founded on scientifically based strategies within curriculum implementation for all participating schools. These communities are known as the Eclectic Model of Professional Learning Communities (MECPA by its acronym in Spanish). The main objective is to improve the educational practices of teachers and increase shared leadership to improve academic achievement of students, using data analysis and continuous reflection. They also contribute to improve communication between teachers. The MECPAs are composed by a group of professionals including: all subject matter teachers, special education teachers, librarian, school counselors, social workers, related services therapists, RAD Coaches, school directors, parents and community. The members of the group may vary depending on the needs identified by the school. During FFY 2017, due to the passage of the mentioned hurricanes, the MECPAs did not begin to meet until the second semester. The goal is for each MECPA to meet at least two times in the spring semester.

4. Schools utilizing data-based strategies in making educational decisions – One of the strategies established for the PRDE what was previously mentioned in the EBP's section is data driven decision making. The purpose of this strategy was to provide the necessary tools in order that the school can use data for decision making. The data analysis made allows the school director to prepare plans to address the deficiencies identified in this assessment results. Two professional development activities regarding use of data-based strategies were provided by the RAD during FFY 2017. Specifically, the topics were:

- > Analysis of Progress Indicators for Decision Making
- > Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL

Also, as part of the coaching service provided by the RAD, the coaches worked on the topic: Assist the teacher with the analysis of student data to implement interventions based on effective strategies according to data analysis.

5. Ensure all Special Education Facilitator positions in the municipalities and the districts are filled to support the schools – as we anticipated in last year's report, the rehiring process for school year 2017 of the Special Education Facilitator was affected by various factors such as the impacts of Hurricane Irma and Maria. The Special Ed Facilitator for the Yabucoa district was finally on place on December 2017.

In addition to these strategies, and as discussed with and evaluated by the Stakeholder Group, during 2017-2018, PRDE continued to impact the selected schools in the additional following ways:

6. The RADs continue provided individual coaching by core subject area for school principals and teachers, including math and special education. The purpose of these services was focused on reinforcing the effective leadership of the school principal and rigorous teaching based on standards and expectations. For this reason, some of the topics covered in the coaching services and follow-up to the director were the following:

- > Development and monitoring of goals and objectives for the school and how to use the data for decision making.
- > Guarantee the use of data in administrative decision making.
- > Assistance in the implementation and execution of the Teacher Evaluation System, encouraging compliance with the visiting calendar, the regulations and the rubric for this purpose.
- > Complete the official template with the data of the academic achievement of the students by grade and subject.

RADs helped teachers develop a deeper understanding of the academic content and how to make it accessible to all subgroups. Also, the RADs support the teachers in the development of their class planning. The topics that were worked on as part of the individual coaching during FFY 2017 were:

- > Support to the teacher in the implementation in the classroom of the activities described to implement project-based learning as revealed by the DEE.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Assist the teacher with the analysis of student data to implement interventions based on effective strategies according to data analysis.
- Support to attend special education populations and Spanish learners and immigrants located in the regular room.
- Use of curricular alignment, scope and sequence document, curricular sequence calendars, curricular unit planning, maps and curricular frameworks.
- Planning of teaching (writing of objectives, performance defects among others).
- Raise levels of depth of knowledge by supporting the design and implementation of teaching-learning strategies that allow students to master the standards by grade and level with special emphasis about mathematics, Spanish, English and Science.

As part of the RAD services, they also provide group coaching around the areas of analysis, discussion and identification of students with problems of academic delay in some of the subjects to select strategies that all teachers can use to increase the academic performance of these students.

7. Extended Learning Time Program for the core subject areas with an emphasis on Spanish and Mathematics – Each RAD, along with the school director, designed a program that provides this extended learning time for students for enrichment and the instruction necessary to meet academic standards. Extended Learning Time began on January 29, 2018. The use of pre-tests aligned to the priority expectations of each grade and subject provided by the RAD was implemented and teachers planned the learning activities based on the test standardized results, academic performance in the classroom and the data obtained in the pre-test administered.

As previously mentioned, during FFY 2017, PRDE conduct a new school specific needs assessment to be addressed during 2018-2019, with the school directors at the SSIP schools. This was established because of the impact of the hurricanes, which could bring to new needs to light. With this needs assessment the school directors had the opportunity to present the strengths and weakness of their math teachers and provide ideas how PRDE could support these teachers and their needs. The school directors indicated that the teachers needed: individual coaching, demonstrative classes including the use of EBPs in math, workshops (with practice exercises) and data driven decision making. In the Plans for Next Year section we include the Work Plan for the 2018-2019 school year in which we wanted to address the needs presented by the school Directors.

A.1 Alignment to Existing Current State Initiatives

During 2017-2018, PRDE implemented various initiatives related to improve the academic performance of students and measure the impact of implementation of the SSIP. These initiatives are:

1. Project Based Learning (PBL) - In the 2017-2018 school year, special emphasis is being placed on Project Based Learning strategy. This is a strategy that allows students to acquire the key knowledge and skills in the 21st century by developing multidisciplinary projects that answer a question or problems in real life. All schools should work on at least one PBL project during the second semester of 2017. As part of the design of the strategy, the projects should be interdisciplinary and include a minimum of three (3) subjects. When designing PBL, it is important that each school identify the skills, concepts and knowledge that students need to learn. Learning objectives should be derived from content standards and curricular maps. As part of the implementation of the strategy, project-based learning can be combined with other methods of instruction such as direct instruction, and teaching materials including textbooks, exams, etc. The important thing is to look for ways to facilitate student's understanding of new content using interactive and engaging techniques.

2. Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) - During the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE determined one area of focus would be the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PRDE seeks to manage inappropriate behaviors that affect school climate, to foster an environment conducive to learning and to increase student achievement. To improve school climate, PRDE implemented a Professional Development Program for teachers and school directors from elementary schools, in order for them to properly implement the PBIS system. PBIS is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students. This program allows participants to learn how to implement a Positive School Behavior Support System to achieve a Positive and Creative School Climate. Likewise, through this professional development program, PRDE engaged the collaborative involvement of parents, students, the community adjacent to the campus, and all school staff to creatively address behavioral problems and violence faced in schools.

PBIS system is an important resource for the progress of the SSIP. Teachers and other school personnel works to manage inappropriate behaviors that affect the classroom climate. As they implement evidence-based behavioral interventions it should be reflected in the student's achievement due to a better learning environment.

While PBIS is a PRDE system-wide initiative, the SAEE has been a key stakeholder in the planning and implementation processes. After all the initial planning, including the establishment of a PBIS work plan, implementation was delayed due to the impacts of Hurricane Maria. The work plan was established for 856 schools which include the primary grades PK-8th grade. The schools from the SSIP impacted by PBIS implementation during FFY 2017 are: Luis Muñoz Rivera and Calzada.

3. Response to Intervention (RTI) - During 2017-2018 school year PRDE implemented another strategy, Response to Intervention (RTI) in the Humacao Region a pilot project. Through the implementation of the RTI model, the PRDE seeks to improve the academic achievement of all students, including students with disabilities or special needs, who are at risk of not reaching goals and expectations of the degree they are studying. It is important to note that the Humacao Region was selected due to the Region with the most needs in infrastructure, personnel, and has the lowest PR Assessment results, and was most affected by the hurricanes. After an RFP process, a company was selected to provide the TA in the Humacao Region schools and included: Innovative Classroom Response Systems ("Clickers") which is a classroom response system or student response system, with a set of hardware and software that facilitates teaching activities such as the following:

- a. A teacher poses a multiple-choice question to his or her students via an overhead or computer projector.
- b. Each student submits an answer to the question using a handheld transmitter (a "clicker") that beams a radio-frequency signal to a receiver attached to the teacher's computer.
- c. Software on the teacher's computer collects the students' answers and produces a bar chart showing how many students chose each of the answer choices.
- d. The teacher makes "on the fly" instructional choices in response to the bar chart by, for example, leading students in a discussion of the merits of each answer choice or asking students to discuss the question in small groups.

The work plan for RTI started on March 2018, started with various meetings with the Humacao Regional Director, Humacao CSEE Personnel, District Special Assistants. The meetings with the District personnel included data analysis to discuss and analyze the results of the students from the PR assessment and students' performance.

B. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation

It is important to note that PRDE is a unitary system, and the PRDE Special Education Stakeholder Group oversees the implementation process. They also participated on the selection of the coherent improvement strategies for all PRDE levels. They share in the decision making since Phase I of the SSIP and provide their expertise and recommendations on the selection of the coherent improvement strategies. The Special Education Stakeholder Group is constituted by:

- Two (2) people with disabilities, of which (1) is a young person with disabilities.
- Six (6) parents of children and youth with disabilities, of which two (2) represent the conditions due to physical impediments; two (2) to the conditions of neurological nature; and two (2) to the conditions derived from mental or behavioral disorders.
- One (1) private citizen of recognized interest in the problems that affect people with disabilities.
- Three (3) scientists recognized as experts in the subjects, will represent each of the conditions described above, that is, one (1) to the physical conditions, one (1) to the mental and one (1) to the neurological, in addition to a school psychologist.
- One (1) representative of the state university.
- Two (2) teachers, one special education and one regular education
- One (1) school principal
- One (1) regional director
- One (1) supervisor designated by the Secretariat
- One (1) representative of the Secretary of Health
- One (1) representative of the Secretary of the Department of Recreation and Sports

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

➤ Two representatives of the Department of the Family, one of which is from the Administration of Families and Children.

➤ From the Department of Labor and Human Resources: one (1) representative of the Secretary and one (1) representative of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

➤ One (1) representative of the Secretary of the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation

➤ One (1) representative of the president of the University of Puerto Rico

As mentioned in the phase III year 2, during FFY 2016, an internal interest group was created for the SSIP that allowed us to hold more frequent meetings at the central level, so that decisions could be made immediately about the activities that were being implemented as part of the project. For the FFY 2017 this group includes the Auxiliary Secretary of Academic Affairs, who is responsible for the implementation of the RAD, the Director of the Mathematics Program and Special Education SSIP Implementation Team. This group began to meet in April 2016 and had an important role in the selection of the professional development activities carried out by the central level during this year.

Following is a summary of the different stakeholder groups involvement on SSIP implementation for this year:

➤ During June 2017, in the meeting with the PRDE Special Education Stakeholder Group, the Phase III year 2 activities to be implemented were discussed and co-planned to assure that they are aligned with our theory of action. Also, the discussion of the work plan for the implementation of the SSIP for the FFY 2017 was developed.

➤ In January 2018, the Internal Interest Group for SSIP had a meeting to discuss the difficulties implementing the improvement strategies planned by SAEF as a result of the passage of the hurricanes Irma and María. The PRDE understood that it could continue with the implementation of the SSIP through the support of the external providers, RAD's (Differentiated Support Network).

➤ In March 2018, the Internal Interest Group for SSIP had a meeting to discuss the results to be presented in the SSIP Report of Phase III year 2 and established the next steps. As part of these steps, it was determined to realize new school specific assessment with the school Directors of the participating schools, for the 2018-2019.

➤ During June 2018, in the meeting with the PRDE Special Education Stakeholder Group the results presented in the SSIP Report of Phase III year 2 were discussed. We also discussed the new needs assessment study realized with the school's principals and the different strategies to respond to these needs. As part of the meeting, the Phase III year 3 proposed activities were discussed to assure that they are aligned with our theory of action. Also, the discussion of the work plan for the implementation of the SSIP for the FFY 2018 was developed.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

A. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan

During FFY 2017, PRDE continued to use different platforms to ensure implementation of interventions carried out by the RAD, school districts and schools. Specifically, these platforms are important regarding the general supervision system (PRDE is a unitary system), and as the key holder of the evidence that demonstrates the fidelity of implementation. This technology makes it easier for the different levels of supervision within PRDE to assure compliance with the working plan established by each school. As mentioned in the previous phases these platforms are:

- SIS - The Student Information System (SIE by its acronym in Spanish) of the PRDE is the system that collects, handles and stores all data related to students and academic offerings in schools. This manages a universal database that stores among others; student demographic information, academic information, school organization, discipline incidents, enrollment, attendance, and student grades.
- DEE4 - Each school develops a school improvement plan (DEE by its acronym in Spanish), which summarizes its objectives and goals for the school year. This year the school comprehensive plan has been totally redesigned and for the first time is based on current year student data. This has given PRDE a clearer idea of student needs and guided professional development plan. Professional development is being focused on attending those content areas in need of improvement.
- SAMA – PRDE developed the Support and Academic Monitoring System platform (SAMA by its acronym in Spanish) to enable central level staff and district personnel to provide monitoring and feedback to schools as they implement their plans. In addition, central level staff members use SAMA to hold meetings with district staff to assess progress, identify support needs and provide ongoing technical assistance to ensure that all schools within the district are served.
- RAD Platform—The online platform called RAD (Differentiated Support System) was developed by PRDE to evidence electronically the services provided at the school level. Also, the RAD is also used to ensure fiscal and contractual compliance. The staff of the Office of Federal Affairs works with the Transformation Unit staff to ensure that all services specified in the system are align with the PCEA of the school.
- Dashboards – PRDE's dashboard is the technological tool that contains comparative tables and graphical summaries of key data related to schools, students and staff. PRDE dashboards include accountability indicators that are aligned with the classification criteria of accountability as well as other data necessary for making decisions based on data. The Office of Information Systems and the Auxiliary Secretary of Transformation, Planning and Performance share responsibility for a) ensuring that the dashboard contains data that are accurate and reliable, b) data is presented in a simple and easy way to be interpreted, c) and ensure that schools, districts, and central level have access to this information for data decision making.

These platforms are part of the initiatives that the agency has developed in recent years to collect and provide accurate and reliable data to account for the performance of multiple actors in the public education system and to develop public policies that result in the provision of better-quality education. These platforms also permit that each higher level supervises the lower level. For example, the district supervises school and the central level supervises districts. It is important to note that SAEF, as part of the central level, has access to each of these platforms, which allows it to maintain a continuous monitoring to measure to assess effectiveness of the strategies implemented. The specific platforms used by the SAEF as a tool to monitor the SSIP implementation were DEE (previously known as PCEA Live), SAMA and RAD Platform.

B. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary

As previously mentioned in the second section of this report, establishing an evaluation matrix to evaluate the progress toward achieving improvement strategies is the biggest challenge that PRDE has had through all phases. However, using the different platforms mentioned above and the information provided by the schools during 2017-2018 school year, PRDE integrated different components to evaluate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies. Some of these data are:

1. ➤ Analysis of the Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on Math from the Selected Schools (META-PR results)
2. ➤ Analysis of the fifth-grade students "As, B's and C's" grades in math for FFY 2015 to FFY 2017
3. ➤ The results of pre- and post-test to measure the knowledge acquired by the teachers in the professional development activities
4. ➤ Evaluation of the instructional coaching services
5. ➤ Summary of the domain of the pre and post test in Mathematics of the Extended Learning Time
6. ➤ Teacher Evaluation System results

1. Accountability System

The PRDE Assessment (META-PR), which brings the data to evaluate compliance with the proposed target. The results of PRDE's evaluation system are used to guarantee the accountability and provide support and feedback to schools on student achievement in relation to the curriculum. Through the development of standards and assessment PRDE ensures that all students have access to high-quality education.

The analysis of data shows that PRDE met its targets for FFY 2017. Table 6, reflects SAEF's SIMR baseline data for (FFY 2015) and the target and outcomes for FFY 2017.

Table 6: FFY 2017 target and outcome

Baseline Data FFY 2017
4/15/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) (2015)

27.63	Target	28.1%
	Data (Outcomes)	30.8%

The table and graph below show in detail the percentage of students with disabilities at the impacted schools who received scores that were considered Proficient or Advanced on the regular 5th grade math assessment.

As presented in the two previous years, another data source that is indicative of progress toward the SiMR is the student's progress report issued every 10 weeks, (it is important to note that because of the passage of the hurricanes the evaluation of students began for school year 17-18 at 20 weeks). The academic progress of the students provides information on the individual growth. This gives the opportunity to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions provided and identify any deficiency. In the graphics below, will be presented the results of the analysis of the students in the 5th grades of the participating schools scoring "As, B's or C's" in Math.

Graphic 1: Analysis of the average of "A's, B's and C's" of the fifth-grade students in mathematics for FFY 2017

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 32

The data in Graphic 1 shows that 65% or more of the student's obtained A, B and C in the progress report issued every 10 weeks. When comparing the data from one period to another, it can be observed that for the 30-week period there was an increase of 4% in the students who obtained A, B and C. For the 40 weeks a reduction of 2% was reflected. However, the percentage of students who obtained A, B and C in this period (67%) was still higher than the percentage of students who obtained A, B and C in the 20 weeks period (65%) that can be considered the line base for this year.

2. Evaluation of the implementation of the Coherent Improvement Strategies

A. Professional Development activities for teachers who served students with disabilities and Schools utilizing data-based strategies in making educational decisions

Two of the improvement strategies, mentioned through the Phases, was to provide professional development for both math and special education teachers and Schools utilizing data-based strategies in making educational decisions. For both strategies, during FFY 2017, the RAD continued to offer professional development to the impacted schools. The professional development activities offered by the RAD were based on the need's studies carried out by the schools. The topics of the workshop provided by the RAD that impacted both strategies are: Project Based Learning, Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL and Analysis of Progress Indicators for Decision Making. To measure the knowledge acquired by the teachers, a pre- and post-test was submitted to the participants. Below we presented the results of these pre and post test.

Graphic 2: Summary of the Pre and Post Test results of the workshop Titled: Project Based Learning

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 34

The results in graphic 2 reflect that teachers demonstrated an 62.3% increase in gained knowledge from the pre-test to the post-test regarding Project Based Learning.

Graphic 3: Summary of the Pre and Post test results of the Workshop Titled: Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 34

The results in graphic 3 reflect that teachers demonstrated an 50.6% increase in gained knowledge from the pre-test to the post-test regarding Design of Rubrics for the Use of Data in PBL.

Graphic 4: Summary of the Pre and Post test results of the Workshop Titled: Analysis of Progress Indicators for Decision Making

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 35

The results in graphic 4 reflect that teachers demonstrated an 53.6% increase in gained knowledge from the pre-test to the post-test regarding Analysis of Progress Indicators for Decision Making.

At school level, PRDE also provided professional development activities for both general and special education teachers. Some of the workshop provided by the participating schools were: Differentiated instruction as an educational strategy to improve academic achievement by attending the needs of all students, The ABC as a teaching and curricular integration strategy and Project-based learning as an educational strategy to improve student academic achievement. Below we presented the results of the pre and post test for each workshop.

Graphic 5: Summary of the Pre and Post test results of the Workshop Titled Differentiated instruction as an educational strategy to improve academic achievement by attending the needs of all students provided in the Eugenio María de Hostos School

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 36

The results in graphic 5 reflect that teachers of EMH school demonstrated an 33% increase in gained knowledge from the pre-test to the post-test regarding Differentiated instruction as an educational strategy to improve academic achievement by attending the needs of all students.

Graphic 6: Summary of the Pre and Post test results of the Workshop Titled Project Based Learning as an educational strategy to improve students' academic achievement provided in Calzada School

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 36

The results in graphic 6 reflect that teachers of Calzada school demonstrated an 53% increase in gained knowledge from the pre-test to the post-test regarding Project Based Learning as an educational strategy to improve students' academic achievement.

B. Coaching

As we mentioned previously in this report, the RADs continued offering coaching to schools throughout the academic year. The following coherent improvement strategies are impacted through the coaching service:

- > Strengthen instructional planning of special education teachers
- > Increase communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education (To increase communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education, PRDE developed professional learning communities founded on scientifically based strategies that lead the curriculum implementation for all participating schools. These communities are known as the Eclectic Model of Professional Learning Communities (MECPA by its acronym in Spanish)
- > Schools utilizing data-based strategies in making educational decisions

With the purpose of evaluate the coaching services, the RAD developed a survey in which the teachers can evaluate the impact of the instructional coaching that they received. The criteria evaluated in the survey of these services were:

1. Each visit from my coach has a supportive approach and is discussed with me during the visits.
2. My coach demonstrates knowledge of the PRDE curricular materials and mastery of teaching and learning strategy.
3. My coach has helped me identify the strengths and challenges of my teaching practice.
4. My coach helps me focus on the impact of my actions as a teacher and how they influence the student's academic achievement.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

5. At the end of each visit, my coach help me to establish and discuss what I need

6. My coach offers to model effective instructional strategies.

7. My coach helps me use data as a basis for making decisions focused on the academic achievement of my students.

8. My coach has supported me in the implementation of the PBL.

Like the last year, to evaluate the services, the teachers had to assign a score of 1-3 to each of the statements. Once the results of the survey (coaching services evaluation) are obtained and analyzed, the RAD shares and discusses the results with the district. As part of this discussion, decisions are made regarding the results of the evaluation. In the same way, through the RAD Platform, the SAE at central level saw the results of the evaluation of these services. When the results of the evaluation are not as expected, the central level communicates with the district to know what actions will be taken to address the deficiencies reflected in the evaluation made to these services. The general results, obtained from the coaching services evaluation, of all the teachers from the participating schools in the SSIP are presented below:

Graphic 7: Evaluation of the Coaching Services

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 39

Like the past year, the evaluation results positive. The above graph reflects, that 90% or more of the teachers for the participants schools were highly agreed or agree with the criteria statements 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8. The 89% are highly agree or agree with the criteria statement 3 and the remaining 89% are highly agree or agree with the criteria statement 6.

D. Extended Learning Time Program

As mentioned in the section II one strategy implemented by the RAD during the FYY 2017 was the Extended Learning Time Program. At the beginning of the Program, a pre-tests aligned with the expectations of each grade level in Mathematics were administered. Then, when the Program ended, a post test was administered with the purpose of evaluating the domain of the participating students with these expectations. In the following table we presented the results of the domain of the pre and post math test of the Program. The results are presented by school.

Table 7: Results of the domain of the pre and post math test of the Extended Learning Time Program

Schools	Number of students who dominated the pre test	%	Number of students who dominated the post test	%
Eugenio M. de Hostos	0/5	0%	0/5	0%
Luis M. Rivera	0/6	0%	2/6	33%
Quebrada Honda	0/1	0%	0/1	0%
Calzada	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jorge Rosario del Valle	0/8	0%	2/8	25%
Marín Bajo	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
María T. Delgado	0/4	0%	1/4	25%

As shown in the table above, two schools had no participants in the Program (Calzada and Marín Bajo). Of the remaining five, in two there were no students who domain the post test (Quebrada Honda and Eugenio M. de Hostos). In the Luis M. Rivera the 33% of the students dominated the post test. In Jorge Rosario del Valle and María T. Delgado schools the 25% of the students dominated the post test.

E. Evaluation of the other PRDE Initiatives implemented during 2017-2018 school year that impacted SSIP – RTI

The Response to Intervention (RTI) strategy, was implemented in the Humacao Region (the same region in which the SSIP is being implemented). The activities carried out as part of the initiative during the year 2017 included seminars, workshops, coaching and demonstrative classes to school and leadership staff of all schools in the Humacao region. In general, the results of the implementation of the initiative for each of the activities carried out were:

➤ Seminars - The seminars met the objective in terms of the positive and significant change in the domain of the contents offered in the seminars and conferences of 27% between the pre-test and the post-test

Workshops - The workshops fulfilled the objective in terms of the positive and significant change in the domain of the contents offered in the workshops and conferences of 27% between the pre-test and the post-test

➤ Coaching Services - The coaching services met the objectives, in terms of the high level of satisfaction with the services, contents offered and resources support (100% of excellent / satisfactory evaluation).

➤ Demonstrative classes – There was a positive change in the gain of knowledge of a 33% from the pre-test and the post-test

E. Teachers Evaluation Process

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies implemented as part of the SSIP in the performance and execution of the teachers, we decided to use the results of the evaluations made to the third, fourth and fifth grade teachers of the participating schools conducted through the PRDE Teacher Evaluation System. This System as explained in the SSIP Phase 3 year 2, it is a three-step process consisting of two visits and the final evaluation, which documents, through observation, the areas of strength and opportunity of the teacher, as well as the next steps to receive academic support and technical assistance. Through this system, PRDE seeks to use the results of the formative evaluation to examine, plan and increase educational practice. It is also important to establish that it is designed to ensure the continuing professional development of educators and to enrich the quality of teaching in schools and student learning.

The system has been designed to provide fair and uniform evaluations offering valuable information regarding professional growth needs to develop professional development opportunities for both effective and less effective teachers that will result in improved student achievement. Through this system, PRDE seeks to use the results of the formative evaluation to analyze, plan and improve educational practice. This way PRDE can formalize the efforts and support that will be offered to teachers to make changes in their professional practice to benefit all students.

The main components of the evaluation process have the basic purpose of establishing a fair and uniform system for the development of highly effective teachers.

1. The use of the Professional Standards of the Teachers as reference for the performance of teachers.

2. Use of formative and summative diagnostic evaluation process that direct and improve instruction.

3. Application of a scale of 4 levels for each indicator in the rubric:

• 4 = meets the expectations

• 3 = partially meets the expectations

• 2 = minimally meets the expectations

• 1 = doesn't comply with the expectations

4. Implementation of the professional development aligned with the results of the evaluation and the level of performance of the teacher.

Bellow you will find the Results of the Teacher Evaluation by grade level. The chart contains the performance of the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers from the participating schools and the special education teachers. Their performance as discussed in the previous page was evaluated by the school director from two different visits with scores ranging from 4 to 1.

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 43

In the graphic above we can see the performance of teachers by grade level. Specifically, we will first discuss the 3rd grade Math teacher performance. For example of the 6 Math teachers from 3rd grade, 5 teachers obtained excellent punctuation on their teacher evaluation whereas 1 teacher obtained 3 points. This teacher had less punctuation because on the 1st evaluation the school director didn't observe in the classroom an organization that promotes differentiated instruction such as: group learning, technological skill center, also didn't demonstrate the use of diverse teaching strategies to promote teacher participation and the use of technology. After the first observation, the school director went on a second observation and the teacher had corrected all the evaluation findings from the first observation.

Regarding the 4th and 5th grade Math teacher evaluation performance all teachers obtained excellent punctuation on both observations of their evaluation process. This demonstrates that the teachers complied with all expectations on the 4 main areas: Planning, Process of Learning and Teaching and the Learning Evaluation.

For the evaluation of the Special Education Teachers 2 of the 3 teachers obtained excellent punctuation. During the first visit the School Director didn't observe that the teacher presents to the students the standard, objective and the theme to which the class corresponds and also the connection with other areas between the lessons, class, theme and projects. After the first visit, in the second observation the teacher had corrected all the evaluation findings from the first observation.

G. RAD Evaluation

During 2017-2018 school year PRDE also contracted a private company to carry out an external evaluation island wide of the RADs with the purpose of assessing the fidelity of implementation of their work. It is important to note that a sample of schools was selected to participate in this evaluation. The evaluation consisted of 51 schools selected by sampling, following up the external evaluation conducted during 2016-2017. Regarding to Yabucua District, one of our participating schools, María T. Delgado, was part of this sample.

The external evaluation was summative with a mixed approach that includes qualitative and quantitative methodologies. As part of the qualitative evaluation, questionnaires, interviews and focus groups were conducted with the purpose of evaluating compliance with the programmatic and academic aspects. In terms of the overall results, through the analysis of the qualitative data, the satisfaction of the school directors, teachers, parents and students was evidenced with:

- the support to the directors and the teachers through coaching,
- participation in the workshops,
- processes of use and analysis of data for decision-making in the teaching-learning process,
- the importance of working with effective teaching strategies such as the integration of technology or differentiated instruction,
- the impact of the Extended Learning Time (TLE) on students.

The evaluation report shows that for school directors, the most important aspect of RAD in their school is the administrative support, for teachers it is coaching and for parents it is extended learning time.

C. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation

PRDE SAAE understands the importance of having the participation of the stakeholder group to achieve an appropriate evaluation on the implementation of the SSIP. Because of that various meetings with this stakeholder group were held to receive their input regarding this Phase, including the evaluation processes. Considering the difficulty that the PRDE has faced to developing an evaluation matrix, in a meeting with this group the criteria used to evaluate on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies implemented during this year were validated.

The stakeholder group also collaborated in the analysis of the results of PRDE's regular assessment and in analyzing the comparison of the growth on student achievement at the 10, 20, 30 and 40 weeks. As mentioned in the previous section, during June 2018, in the meeting with the PRDE Special Education Stakeholder Group were discuss the results presented in the SSIP Report of Phase III year 2.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

During Phase III- year 3 of implementation, PRDE SAAE had data limitations that affected the collection of the data for the report. Although, this limitation didn't affect the achieving the SIMR.

One of the principal limitations that affected the data collection was the failure of the communication by internet that was not established in some cases until June 2018. Considering this limitation, during May 2018 the directors of the participating schools were summoned to a meeting with the purpose of providing the data and all the evidences related to the implementation of the initiative during 2017-2018 school year, many of them did not bring the required evidence to the meeting and also did not upload it to the platforms developed for these purposes (SAMA, DDE and RAD). This highlights one of the issues presented in the 2015 report (Phase III year 1) when we mentioned that despite PRDE has various technological platforms that improve our general supervision system and evidences It's important to note that the PRDE did not have a full-time coordinator dedicated to overseeing the implementation and evaluation of SSIP and at the same time monitor the schools and through the different platforms to obtain all the data necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of all the strategies implemented as part of the SSIP.

This made it difficult to have for the necessary data to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies implemented in some of the areas, such as teacher's evaluation. It should be noted that the results on the teachers' evaluation process presented in this report do not include the information of all the third, fourth and fifth grade teachers of the participating schools because some of the principals of the schools consolidated, never forwarded the evaluations to the SAAE as requested. For 2018-2019, the teacher evaluation process is being worked through the system, which will allow for a more uniform process and better access to data on the results of this evaluation process.

On the other hand, as indicated earlier in this report during the 2017-2018 the teacher evaluation process experienced some changes including the form used to document the final evaluation. This prevented that the results could be presented in a more comprehensive manner as it was done last year. Likewise, it limited the possibility of making a comparison with last year's results, performing an analysis of progress in this area.

Regarding the external evaluation made to the RADs, as mentioned, they were carried out at the island wide. Likewise, the results were presented in a general way for the 51 schools in the sample, which limited the ability to have data that would indicate if the interaction of the RAD was effective in the SSIP participating schools.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

The data presented on the Data section demonstrates the effectiveness of the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies selected in our SSIP. First, the data shows that, the percentage of special education students from the 5th grade who scored proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools was exceeded the target, reaching 30.8%. When evaluating the progress of the established targets during the phases it is shown that in all years of implementation, the target was reached and even exceeded. The table below shows the progress through the phases.

Table 8: Reported progress through the phases to achieving the proposed targets

Baseline Data	FFY	2016	2017	2018
---------------	-----	------	------	------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
(2015)

27.63	Target	27.6%	28.1%	28.6%
	Data	30.6%	30.8%	

As mentioned, the progress made toward achievement of improvement, during 2017-2018 exceeded our proposed target from 28.1% to 30.8%, once again showing the effectiveness of the implementation of the strategies selected in our SSIP. The data shows that, the percentage of special education students from the 5th grade who scored proficient or advanced on the regular assessment for math from the selected schools exceeded the expectation by reaching 3% in FFY 2016 and 2.7% over the target in FFY 2017.

The following graphic presents a comparison of the results of the 5th grade students who scored A, B or C in the 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years.

Graphic 9: Progress of the number of students of 5th grade who obtained A, B and C in the 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 school year

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 48

By comparing the progress of the grades from one year to another we can identify that in 2016 there was a decrease in the number of students with A, B, and C grades as compared to 2015. Additionally, grades include other factors other than test scores, such as homework and completion of class assignments, that can influence the grade performance of the FFY 2016 and 2017. However, if we compare the performance of the students for the last 2 years, we could see that there was an increase in the performance of the 30 and 40 weeks during FFY 2017. In the 30 weeks there was a 9% increase in the number of students who executed with A, B and C and in the 40 weeks there was a 7% of increase. As previously mentioned, we understand that the lack of direct intervention of the math facilitator with the mathematics teachers also had an impact in the grades obtained in the subject of mathematics during the year 2017-2018.

In the case of the professional development activities, two of the improvement strategies (provide professional development for both math and special education teachers and Schools utilizing data-based strategies in making educational decisions) were implemented. The results of the pre and post tests for professional development activities carried out during school year 2017-2018, showed gain in knowledge of the teachers from a 33% to 62% through each PD activities. As established in the theory of action, this have an impact in the growth in the academic achievement of our students. Below is presented the percentage on gain in knowledge by each workshop.

Graphic 10: Gain in Knowledge Acquired by Teachers in the Professional Development Activities

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED THE SSIP REPORT WITH THIS GRAPHIC ON PAGE 49

Finally, as mentioned in the Data Quality Issue Section, the fact that the form used in the teacher evaluation process changed during fiscal year 2017, prevented comparative data from being used to analyze progress in this area.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

A. Additional activities to be implemented next year

After the passage of Hurricanes Maria and Irma around the island PRDE and SAEE with their stakeholder group determined to have a meeting with the school Directors from the participating schools on May 2018. With the main purpose of identifying new needs for their teachers, considering among other aspects, the consolidation of schools. All of the school directors from the participating schools were eager to present the needs of their math and special education teachers. The dynamic used with the school directors was learned in the NCSI Fall Face to Face meeting. The dynamic helped them organize their thoughts and narrow down to specific needs. It was determined that they need 4 workshops, individual attention (Coaching) more individual than group and mentoring. This was very helpful to determine the Plans for Next Year and how with the support of SAEE we could fulfill all the needs.

Considering the needs identified SAEE, and the limitations presented previously in this report, as first step will identify a part time coordinator for the SSIP. It also will identify a provider for deliver direct services to the participating schools. With the main goal of trying to work aggressively on the Work Plan to be accomplished during the school year 2018-2019 for the remaining 3 participating schools: Luis Munoz Rivera, Maria T. Delgado and Padre Jorge Rosario Del Valle. The table below shows the main activities that are expected to be implemented through the hiring of an external provider during the 2018-2019 school year.

Activity	Title	Timeline	Personnel to be impacted
Provide Workshops	1. The use of technology in the math teaching process	November 2018	
	2. Math thru differentiated instruction	December 2018	
	3. Data decision making with in Math	January 2019	30 participants including Math Teachers, Special Education Teachers, School Directors and other personnel as needed
	4. Reading Comprehension and its relationship with the META assessment in Math	February 2019	
Instructional Coaching (individual or grupal)	6 hours of coaching for each participant for the 4 workshops = 24 hours of coaching by participant	After each workshop 6 hours by participant	
Mentoring	10 hours of mentoring by participant	After each workshop 10 hours by participant	
Develop an evaluation tool	Develop a document that thru observation of the math and special ed class	March 2019	At least 50% of the participating teachers

With each workshop the acquisition of knowledge will be evaluated with pre and posttests. After each workshop the teachers will receive coaching and mentoring. The coaches generate for each service provided a document that contains the labor report, needs identified, activities performed, outline of results, findings and recommendations. Also, the teachers evaluate the performance of the services received by the coaches. SAEE is planning to make a document that could evaluate if the teachers in their classroom are implementing the strategies learned in the workshops with fidelity.

PRDE plans through the SSIP Coordinator bring a direct follow up to all the activities proposed for the 2018-2019 school year. As part of this follow up, this coordinator will participate in the workshops and will visit the schools to observe the coaching and mentoring services as part of the monitoring process to assure the fidelity of the implementation. In coordination with the school's social workers PRDE plan to realize a workshop for parents on how to help the students in the learning process.

PRDE plans to execute the work plan as proposed for the next year in an organized manner, reviewing it as many times as necessary. This for the purpose of improving or amending the planned activities with the expectation of meeting or exceeding the established goal.

B. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The 2017-2018 year was the last year in which PRDE signed a contract with the RADs to provide support to the schools. This is because the initiative was part of the Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal View that was replaced by the ESSA Plan. For this reason, it is necessary to identify a new provider to offer direct services to the participating schools. As we all know, Puerto Rico is going through economic challenges our first challenge would be to identify the funds to hire a company. Once the funds have been identified, the other steps would be to make the contract process as agile as possible so that the activities can be carried out during the school year and we can meet the proposed schedule.

Another anticipated barrier is the number of initiatives that are occurring at the school level simultaneously, such as: PBIS, RTI, SSIP, PBL. All these initiatives point to low performance in the PR Evaluation (META). This could result in an overload of work for the school principal and teacher, which in the end could lead to poor participation or lack of interest in professional learning. To avoid this, we plan to provide more hours of training and tutoring, instead of workshops since they are services that are provided in a more individualized way so that teachers feel that their needs are being addressed in a specific way and at the same time Coaches can work directly with the needs of teachers.

C. The State describes any needs for additional support and/ or technical assistance

PRDE appreciates the TA received by OSEP during the implementation of the SSIP such as on site and TA calls. It has been very beneficial that OSEP was always available to clarify doubts. Also, technical assistance from the NCSI has been very valuable. They have helped us in the development of PRDE SSIP through all Phases. The Math Collaborative and the Face to Face Meetings helps networking with other States and share resources and strategies implemented, that have demonstrated to be effective. NCSI has also provided individualized support to PRDE with SSIP reporting, RTI implementation and other PRDE initiatives. SAAE would like to continue with the technical assistance received as it has shown to be beneficial. We understand that in order to be effective and successful in the next Phases this technical assistance would be significant on the on-going evaluation process. We appreciate all the support received.

OSEP Response

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Daiber Carrion Munoz

Title: PR Special Education Compliance Officer

Email: carrionmdn@de.pr.gov

Phone: 787-380-6997