

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2019**

**Puerto Rico**



**PART B DUE  
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

During the FY 2019 APR reporting period, Puerto Rico experienced at least three major events which significantly impacted the island and school system: the government experienced changes in leadership, an unprecedented series of earthquakes, and the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic. For the first time in the history of Puerto Rico, we had a change of Governor prior to the completion of the period established in the PR Constitution, when then-Governor Ricardo Roselló Nevárez resigned from his position on July 24, 2019. This transition marked the beginning of the school year 2019-2020. On December 29, 2019, Puerto Rico experienced the beginning of an unprecedented series of seismic events Island wide with a 5.0 earthquake. Additional major earthquakes shook the island on January 6, 2020 (5.8), and January 7, 2020 (6.4) and continued for weeks. The most affected area was the southern part of the island, especially the towns of Guánica, Guayanilla, Yauco, Peñuelas and Ponce. Schools collapsed and were destroyed. Considering the health and safety of the students and teacher population, the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) ordered the inspection of all schools prior to their opening of the second semester. This resulted in all schools remaining closed from the time PRDE schools broke for winter recess on December 20, 2019 through January 27, 2020. As the inspection and certification process of the school facilities were completed, the opening of the schools was ordered by phases beginning January 28, 2020 (East and North side of the island). While some schools began to open January 28, throughout February, and into the beginning of March 2020, many schools never had the chance to reopen before systemwide closures were mandated due to the COVID-19 outbreak. The PRDE Secretariat of Special Education (SAEE by its Spanish acronym) in response to the emergency caused by the earthquake immediately issued written communication to all staff and the community with recommendations on how to assist families during school closures to stimulate skills and provide therapeutic strategies for students with disabilities. Schools worked to help students and families as they struggled with trauma related to the earthquakes. Workshops were held on how to deal with an earthquake, the offer of therapy services was guaranteed and the assistance of professional school counselors, school social workers, professional counseling teachers, social workers and Psychologists were made available, in order to provide support to the school community. Likewise, there was availability of online course registration for high school degrees, the PRDE Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs by their Spanish acronym) continued to operate and provide services to the special education population. To this day, the seismic activity continues.

Less than two months after schools began reopening from the earthquake closures, Puerto Rico schools were again shut down effective March 13 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remain closed and have officially been closed for the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year. On March 16, 2020 the government of PR published the first Executive Order OE-2020-20 which came into force to address the crisis by the Covid-19 pandemic and established a full lock down in PR. Faced with great challenges and assuming our constitutional responsibility, the PRDE made adjustments to continue leading the teaching-learning process. To continue providing education the PRDE selected 4 strategies: modules (work packets), classes provided via TV, virtual learning via live video conferencing with teacher, and learning platforms that allowed for completion on-line assignments/activities. These various strategies were available for families to and allowed each family multiple options for continuing virtual learning. The PRDE undertook significant efforts to support teachers, parents and students. PRDE provided virtual trainings on the use of the platform TEAMS to parents and students. For teachers, PRDE made virtual learning schools with TEAMS which were mandatory. These trainings were available on different schedules to best accommodate the availability of the teacher. SAEE's response efforts were made so that the staff of the CSEEs responded using technological strategies, so they could offer services, even with the mandatory restrictions imposed by the governor's executive orders, services such as eligibility determinations and IEP reviews of those parents interested in the virtual process. During this period, the SAEE established guidelines, such as: students can keep taking modules from home (they are published on the DE website) which will then be counted as part of the cumulative scores. The SAEE reviewed the modules and formatted them so the reader programs could benefit blind students. At the same time, guidelines have been issued for teachers including special education teachers who must be modifying and adapting available materials to support their students. PRDE officially finished the 2019-2020 school year on May 8, 2020. This experience allows us to continue working to improve, prepare and respond to future events.

The structure of PRDE continues to operate as a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. The PR 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. PR Law 51 provides autonomy to the SAEE and establishes that the PR Associate Secretary for Special Education responds directly to the PR Secretary of Education. In 2018, PRDE established a new administrative structure, which eliminates the 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 PR 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.

### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Within the work plan of the Department of Education under the "Restart" funds, the Associated Secretary for Special Education began with the "Upgrade" Project of the Mi Portal Especial Information System (MiPE). PRDE takes this initiative with the mission of being able to provide users with a better experience when carrying out the processes of the special education program. Using new technology, users have a more agile platform with cutting-edge technology which can be accessed through multiple types of devices (Laptop, Desktop, Tablets or Mobile Devices). In addition, the new version was developed with a new design that seeks for the platform to have an academic approach that prioritizes the user experience, in such a way that it is

very easy to use. In addition, the new platform allows processes to be worked in a more agile and efficient. The platform is designed with the focus of supporting the DEPR to collect data and be able to comply with the offer of services and according to different state and federal regulations.

The vision of the scope of the project in its first phase was to move the three main modules of the System to the new technology: Electronic IEPs, Students Module, Electronic Invoice. The first phase was developed during FY2019-20 which also included a DashBoard module developed to accurately present data to users to promote compliance. Currently, we are working in a second phase of the project that includes modules related to Human Resources, Academic Progress, Parent Portal and others.

Since 2012 PRDE has been developing an Information System called Mi Portal Especial (MiPE) that has become the main source for data collection for all the process related to the Special Education Program. PRDE has develop modules to collect the majority of the OSEP APR Indicators through MiPE in order to have the data in one system. During the Covid19 Pandemic, the decision of developing modules to collect data for the APR in MiPE allowed PRDE to continue the data collection remotely. In addition, during the pandemic, PRDE was able to continue the services virtually because of the incorporation of the majority of the Special Education processes through MiPE. PRDE was able to follow up process like: Registration, Eligibility, IEPs, provision of Therapy Services, Billing of the Related Services, Assistive Technology Process and many others.

#### **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.**

As stated in previous APRs 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 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 SAEE carries out work at the regional level with significant support from its Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs). The SAEE 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. The CSEEs 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 called 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 2019-2020 SAEE 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.

To ensure services for students with IEPs in the Juvenile Institutions (both are located in the Ponce Region) one of the Technical Assistance Unit Facilitators is also the Juvenile Institutions Coordinator which serves as the liaison between the school director and special education teachers who provide services to these students. These Coordinator has to identify the needs of professional development for the teachers. As part of this effort during this school year several trainings were provided to the teachers on IEP goals and MiPE.

#### **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 SAEE has a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) that is responsible for setting public policy on educational aspects related to the special education program. 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, assessment and assistive technology. Additionally, in the new PRDE organization the TAU personnel are assigned to support each of the 7 Regional Educational Office (ORE), with their individualized needs. In the DE organization each ORE has a Special Education Facilitator in the Academic area with the Chief Academic Officer and in the Student Services Area a Superintendent of that area. The personnel from the TAU is the liaison for the ORE with the Special Education Central Level Office (SAEE) and are the key components who identify the technical assistance needs for the ORE and coordinate activities related to providing support and technical assistance to schools. Additionally, each TAU staff member is designated as the team member with special expertise in a specific subject matter(s) (e.g., adaptive 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 is also responsible of implementing the professional development and technical assistance work plan of the SAEE. The TA and professional development is on-going during the school year and has the purpose of improving compliance and or indicator performance, making sure the special education personnel, community and 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 2019-2020 school year, the TAU provided TA and professional development to all level staff (central level, ORE and school level) on the program including new policies and procedures. The orientations have included, assessment, how to properly develop IEPs, pre-school and post-secondary goals, APR Indicator B7 data collection including how to evaluate students adequately using the "Resumen 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), how to develop meeting minutes, ABA behavior strategies for autism teachers, PBIS Tier 1 and 2. Also the TAU made an Agreement with the University of Puerto Rico and Department of Health to develop a guide for pre-school transition. During this school year the SAEE implemented the Modified and alternate diploma

with input from all parent advocacy groups including our stakeholder group. After the policies were in place, the SAE TAU provided TA to the community (Parents, School Directors, Paraprofessionals) stakeholder group and Special Education Facilitators. On this matter for the special education teacher, professional development was provided to ensure that they would have the tools to identify the level of functioning of their student. This would give them the knowledge to properly select the study program that best adjust to their student's performance. Also the TAU made an Agreement with the University of Puerto Rico (UPR) for them to validate the modified and alternate Diploma in the process of admitting students. Also with the UPR the TAU made an agreement to start the development of the transition to adulthood Guide and Curriculum which we aim to have finished at the end of school year 2020-2021.

Since 2018 PR has been implementing PBIS. The SAE has impacted 612 elementary and middle schools around the island which include the grades of PK-8th grade. We have implemented Tier 1 and 2 of Trauma Informed PBIS. For this school year we are incorporating to the PBIS school committee the newly hired social workers and school psychologists. It has been of great benefit to the school community having tools on how to implement positive behavior interventions and we have had great response from schools. PBIS will be continued to be implemented during the next school year, making sure that efforts made before and during the pandemic will be solidified and sustainable. During the school year 2019-2020 a new version of MIPE was published. Orientations have been carried out throughout the Island.

### **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.**

Herein, we describe the professional development system and related efforts provided during the school year 2019-2020. First, 90% of the Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) personnel have a Doctorate Degree and more than 10 years of experience working in Special Education. Also, as Central level personnel, the TAU members are part of the committee that develops the public policy of the SAE which gives them the knowledge to provide the technical assistance. Regarding the professional development related to post secondary transition, the SAE is working with Dr. Ernesto Perez who is part of the Secondary Transition Coalition of the Kentucky University and the Vanderbilt University from Nashville Tennessee Iris Program. Also, the TAU Director receives TA from the National Transition Assistance Center (NTACT). For the autism teachers training in ABA, the SAE contracted with 2 ABA certified specialists. At the same time for the most severe autism students the Star and Links curriculum program is an EBP, research validated, ABA Based and award winning comprehensive web based curriculum to teach all level including post-secondary. The Links curriculum provides lesson plans to the teachers for the purpose of providing the tools in independence in daily routines. The PBIS Program is implemented with the mentoring and Guidance of Dr. Heather George from the University of South Florida and the National Center for Technical Assistance in PBIS. Since this is the first time is been implemented in PR the Leader in the SAE is a well recognized Psychologist in PR. For the services for deaf blind and blind student populations, the SAE receives TA from the Helen Keller National Center for the Blind and Deaf Blind Region 4B, the American Printing house provides us with the books and materials for these students and we also receive TA from the National Instructional Materials Access Center. The Modified and alternate diploma was developed with TA from NCTAC and after evaluating different models from other States. PRDE found the Louisiana Believe model to be especially helpful because Louisiana's policy regarding post-secondary transition is very similar to Puerto Rico's. Also, the requirement for the students eligible who would qualify attending the needs of the PR students with IEPs who would receive educational services in special education class room.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

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

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

PRDE has had a copy of its FFY 2018 SPP/APR as well as prior SPP/APRs available on its website at: <https://de.pr.gov/educacion-especial/cumplimiento/>. The FFY 2018 SPP/APR can be directly accessed at: <https://de.pr.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/pr-01-apr-part-b-ffy-2018-19.pdf>

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the

State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

During FY 2019, and since the issuance of OSEP's determinations on June 20, 2019, PRDE SAEI received technical assistance from outside sources such as USDE-funded technical assistance centers, NCSI, IDC (IDEA Data Center), and CIFR. For the 2019-2020 school year, PRDE SAEI worked with NCSI to receive guidance around provision of services and virtual IEPs during the COVID-19 pandemic, which aid PRDE with ensuring provision of FAPE in students education placements reflected in Indicators 5 and 6. PRDE also received assistance from IDC regarding IDEA data collection and the COVID-19 pandemic impact. PRDE also participated in an Early Child Learning during COVID-19 session provided by an OSEP-funded technical assistance provider. PRDE SAEI continued participation with the CIFR Communities of Practices-Southeast. PRDE has also participated in OSEP's monthly technical assistance webinars which have been extremely valuable. As a result of this assistance, PRDE was able to take actions that allowed it to continue ensuring the provision of FAPE for students across Puerto Rico during extended school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

PRDE's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed PRDE that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which PRDE received assistance; and (2) the actions PRDE took as a result of that technical assistance. PRDE provided the required information.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the State did not provide data for Indicator 17. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

#### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	70.98%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	56.60%	56.70%	56.80%	56.90%	57.00%
Data	61.00%	72.55%	80.12%	70.99%	70.98%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	70.99%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,757

Source	Date	Description	Data
(EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)			
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,017
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	67.79%

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,757	7,017	70.98%	70.99%	67.79%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The data for FFY 2019 reflects slippage compared to FFY 2018 (a decrease from 70.98% to 67.79%). It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, but one consideration is the changes in the Puerto Rico population over the past several years, particularly in light of FFY 2018 being the first year PRDE reported under Indicator 1 using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. For purposes of this discussion, it is important to note that, as per the APR instructions, Indicator 1 examines data for the year before the reporting year. As such, for the FFY 2019 APR, Indicator 1 examines data from 2018-2019; for the FFY 2018 APR, Indicator 1 examines data from 2017-2018.

As discussed in prior APRs, Puerto Rico experienced a significant increase in migration off of the island in the weeks and months after being hit by Hurricanes Irma and Maria in September 2017, resulting in a significant decrease in student population. While many families subsequently returned to Puerto Rico following the 2017 child count date, Puerto Rico continued to experience significant migration off of the island as well. The challenges that Hurricanes Irma and Maria brought to Puerto Rico were significant, having profound impacts on families in Puerto Rico. These were lasting impacts that continued into, and in some cases, were compounded, over the period of the next academic year (2018-2019).

At the same time, as has been reported in Puerto Rico's prior APRs and herein, the 2017-2018 academic year was the first year in which PRDE calculated Indicator 1 data using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Due to the change in the cohort, Puerto Rico revised its baseline for Indicator 1 using 2017-2018 (FFY 2018, for purposes of Indicator 1) data. Considering the changes in Puerto Rico's population and the unique situations faced across the island during the 2017-2018 academic year, it is possible that data from that year does not provide an ideal baseline.

PRDE will continue to review annual data to determine whether the baseline should be revised.

**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 could 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 was an adaptation of the method recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics. At the time of the 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 then-new rate. As such, PRDE reported Indicator 1 using Puerto Rico's approved 3 year cohort graduation rate for the first time with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR. PRDE continued reporting using a three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate through the 2016-2017 academic year (data reported in the FFY 2017 APR). The three-year adjusted cohort rate, starting with the 10th grade and ending with graduation in the 12th grade, was aligned with grade-level structure of most Puerto Rico high schools throughout that period. During that time, most of Puerto Rico's High Schools were composed of those three levels (grades 10-12). For the 2017-2018 academic year (data provided on the 2018 APR), PRDE implemented a new administrative structure, which includes adding the 9th grade level to the High School composition. This alignment better allows PRDE to now calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students starting in the 2017-2018 academic 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.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	43.36%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	35.50%	35.00%	34.50%	34.00%	33.50%
Data	34.99%	33.92%	32.34%	25.46%	24.80%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	33.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to

develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEH held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,816
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	292
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	190
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,597
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	16

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,597	6,911	24.80%	33.00%	23.11%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.50%	98.74%
A	Overall	98.73%	Actual	98.78%	98.87%	99.16%	98.54%	98.87%

### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.50%	98.45%
A	Overall	98.44%	Actual	98.98%	99.06%	99.03%	98.31%	98.74%

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.74%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.45%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to

develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

NO

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			98.87%	98.74%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			98.74%	98.45%		N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to widespread school closures related to the novel Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), the United States Secretary for Education invited states to apply for waivers for the statewide administration of assessments and certain accountability provisions of ESEA back when the pandemic hit. As discussed in the OSEP October 2020 Monthly Technical Assistance Call, all states (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) requested and were granted waivers. As such, as discussed in that technical assistance call, no data or information is required for this indicator in the FFY 2019 APR.

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

PRDE was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	26.50%	27.00%	27.25%	27.50%	27.75%
A	Overall	24.28%	Actual	29.79%	35.22%	33.46%	31.36%	30.63%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	23.25%	23.75%	24.00%	24.25%	24.50%
A	Overall	19.30%	Actual	27.30%	29.65%	28.91%	28.95%	26.50%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	27.85%
Math	A >=	Overall	24.60%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAE E personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAE E 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAE E is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group form the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**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											
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											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**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											
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											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			30.63%	27.85%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			26.50%	24.60%		N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to widespread school closures related to the novel Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), the United States Secretary for Education invited states to apply for waivers for the statewide administration of assessments and certain accountability provisions of ESEA back when the pandemic hit. As discussed in the OSEP October 2020 Monthly Technical Assistance Call, all states (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) requested and were granted waivers. As such, as discussed in that technical assistance call, no data or information is required for this indicator in the FFY 2019 APR.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

PRDE was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**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

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

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%
Data	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, 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.**

7

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
			0.00%		N/A	N/A

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

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. Previously, PRDE operated four school districts within each educational region (a total of 28 school districts). During FFY 2018, PRDE eliminated the administrative district divisions within each educational region while maintaining the seven education regions, now known as the Oficina Regional Educativa (or OREs, by its acronym in Spanish). While the OREs may in some ways operate similarly to 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 compared the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 28 school districts (although they are not LEAs) within Puerto Rico. With the administrative change eliminating the 28 school districts, with last year's APR submission (FFY 2018) PRDE began comparing the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 7 OREs (although they are not LEAs).

Under this methodology, PRDE compares ORE rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability. An ORE 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 OREs from the calculation. Thus, if the ORE has fewer than 10 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year, that ORE is not included in the calculation. ORE rates are calculated by dividing the ORE'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 ORE.

In reviewing all 7 OREs for FFY 2019, PRDE found that none of the 7 OREs met the minimum n size for this indicator. As such, no further analysis was required.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

### 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 4B- Required Actions

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	76.67%	77.00%	77.33%	77.67%	77.85%
A	67.74%	Data	81.07%	70.26%	76.27%	72.09%	67.24%
B	2019	Target <=	7.70%	7.20%	6.70%	6.20%	5.70%
B	9.43%	Data	6.01%	6.94%	8.64%	9.22%	8.94%
C	2019	Target <=	3.80%	3.60%	3.40%	3.20%	3.00%
C	1.72%	Data	2.87%	2.75%	2.30%	2.23%	1.83%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	67.25%
Target B <=	8.93%
Target C <=	3.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	95,112
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64,431
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,965
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,173
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	46
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	420

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64,431	95,112	67.24%	67.25%	67.74%	Met Target	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,965	95,112	8.94%	8.93%	9.43%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,639	95,112	1.83%	3.00%	1.72%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision. In its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, the State must revise the "Historical Data" table to reflect that the baseline year for this indicator is FFY 2018.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

With the FFY 2018 APR, OSEP approved PRDE's proposal to revise its baseline, using data from FFY 2018. As such, OSEP required PRDE to revise the "Historical Data" table to reflect that the baseline year for this indicator is FFY 2018. PRDE revised the pre-populated data in the "Historical Data"

table indicating a baseline year of 2012 to correctly reflect that the baseline year for this indicator is FFY 2019. Additionally with the FFY 2018 APR, OSEP accepted Puerto Rico's revised targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator. The pre-populated data did not reflect the correct revised FFY 2019 targets, and so Puerto Rico was sure to update that data to ensure it reflected the correct targets for FFY 2019.

## **5 - OSEP Response**

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, the State must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 data.

## **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%
A	81.82%	Data	73.00%	79.35%	78.46%	79.21%	86.12%
B	2019	Target <=	0.74%	0.73%	0.72%	0.71%	0.70%
B	0.15%	Data	0.20%	0.35%	0.19%	0.20%	0.23%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	75.00%
Target B <=	0.70%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,206
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	6,714
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	12
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	6,714	8,206	86.12%	75.00%	81.82%	Met Target	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	12	8,206	0.23%	0.70%	0.15%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 6 - OSEP Response

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The State transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the State's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the State's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, the State must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019 data.

#### 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement 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.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target >=	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	94.11%
A1	94.10%	Data	88.27%	90.51%	90.93%	83.17%	73.02%
A2	2008	Target >=	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%	58.20%

A2	56.00%	Data	58.94%	66.27%	49.55%	52.33%	42.81%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	86.20%	86.40%	86.60%	89.71%
B1	89.70%	Data	85.02%	89.76%	89.29%	80.00%	67.85%
B2	2008	Target >=	49.70%	49.80%	50.00%	50.20%	50.40%
B2	48.80%	Data	53.56%	61.87%	44.28%	43.19%	31.64%
C1	2008	Target >=	91.20%	91.40%	91.60%	91.80%	95.51%
C1	95.50%	Data	90.91%	92.79%	94.10%	85.06%	75.76%
C2	2008	Target >=	69.60%	69.70%	69.80%	69.90%	72.21%
C2	72.20%	Data	67.36%	73.63%	53.61%	56.74%	47.29%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	94.11%
Target A2 >=	56.01%
Target B1 >=	89.71%
Target B2 >=	48.81%
Target C1 >=	95.51%
Target C2 >=	72.21%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEЕ is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 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 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,029

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	63	1.56%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,544	38.32%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	415	10.30%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	570	14.15%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,437	35.67%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	985	2,592	73.02%	94.11%	38.00%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,007	4,029	42.81%	56.01%	49.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	55	1.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,752	43.48%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	534	13.25%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	654	16.23%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,034	25.66%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,188	2,995	67.85%	89.71%	39.67%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,688	4,029	31.64%	48.81%	41.90%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	58	1.44%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,381	34.28%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	334	8.29%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	661	16.41%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,595	39.59%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	995	2,434	75.76%	95.51%	40.88%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,256	4,029	47.29%	72.21%	55.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The FFY 2019 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-A1. It is difficult to determine a definite 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 hopes for strengthening data quality. 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 is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
B1	The FFY 2019 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-B1. It is difficult to determine a definite 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 hopes for strengthening data quality. 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 is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
C1	The FFY 2019 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-C1. It is difficult to determine a definite 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 hopes for strengthening data quality. 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 is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.

**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/no)**

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

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

The process of data collection begins by completing the Resúmen 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 Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar) to determine the child's outcomes in accordance with this indicator's measurement.

Since FFY 2017, PRDE has included the Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. To complete this document, the SAEE has oriented personnel to collect this information in two parts. The first part of the document is filled during the eligibility determination process through MiPE. The second part is filled when the child exited the preschool services. PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B7 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 document. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this document in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### **7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **7 - OSEP Response**

### **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	86.09%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	85.70%	86.70%	87.70%	88.70%	86.10%
Data	84.55%	81.62%	84.75%	86.09%	86.15%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	86.10%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</b>	<b>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
182	221	86.15%	86.10%	82.35%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

383

**Percentage of respondent parents**

57.70%

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

For FFY 2019, 182 respondents (82.35%) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, falling short of the 86.1% target by 1.15% percentage points. This represents slippage of 3.8 percentage points as compared to FFY 2018 data (86.15%). It is difficult to identify a definitive reason for the slippage. The slight slippage on this indicator may be attributed to normal variation when surveying a large population and/or the decrease in the number of respondent parents. In analyzing PRDE's data for this indicator over the past 5 years (FFY 2014-2019), the percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities has fluctuated, ranging from 81.62% to 86.15%, with a mean average of 84.19% (just 1.84 percentage points above the FFY 2019 result). Additionally, a decrease in the number of respondent parents for FFY 2019 may have contributed to the results. While the same number of parents were selected to receive the Indicator 8 survey in both FFY 2018 and FFY 2019, the participation rate for FFY 2019 was lower. For FFY 2018, a total of 296 of the 383 parents selected completed, and returned the survey. This constituted a 77.28% participation rate of the sample group. This year, as the data indicates, only 221 out of the 383 parents selected completed and returned the survey, constituting only a 57.7% participation rate of the sample group. It is likely that the smaller sample could have contributed to a decrease in favorable response. The lower participation rate is most likely attributable to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Normally, follow-up activities to ensure high participation rates are carried out at the school level. While school level follow-up activities were still undertaken, families faced unique challenges due to the pandemic which may have made it more difficult for parents to prioritize such surveys. PRDE increased follow-up from the central level to schools for follow-up to families sent surveys in an effort to combat the challenges anticipated in participation levels with the surveys. In sum, it appears that the slippage may be attributable to normal variations and/or a decrease in the number of respondents rather than being attributable to specific activities.

**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.

<b>Sampling Question</b>	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was sampling used?	YES
If 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 2019 was 103,318 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2019-2020.

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

$$s = [X^2NP(1-P)] / [d^2(N-1) + X^2P(1-P)]$$

Where:

s = required sample size

X<sup>2</sup> = 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 103,318:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= [(3.841) (103,318) (.50) (1-.50)] / [(.05)(.05)(103,318-1) + (3.841) (.50) (1-.50)] \\ &= [(396,844.44) (.50) (1-.50)] / [ (.0025) (103,318) + 1.9205 (.50) ] \\ &= [ 198,422.22 (.50) ] / [ 258.3 + .96025] \\ &= [ 99,211.1] / [259.26] \\ &= 382.67 \\ s &= 383 \text{ parents} \end{aligned}$$

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

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If 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 221 of the 383 parents selected for the sample completed and returned inventories. This constitutes a 57.70% 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 demographics of children receiving special education services in the state.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision. In its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, the State must revise the "Historical Data" table to reflect that the baseline year for this indicator is FFY 2018.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

With the FFY 2018 APR, OSEP approved PRDE's proposal to revise its baseline, using data from FFY 2017. As such, OSEP required PRDE to revise the "Historical Data" table to reflect the correct baseline year for this indicator. Puerto Rico notes that there was a typo in the language OSEP entered in the required actions section. OSEP clearly and correctly noted that PRDE's proposed baseline was based on data from FFY 2017, and OSEP clearly stated it accepted that revision. However, in the second sentence, OSEP mistakenly stated that PRDE should revise the pre-populated data in the "Historical Data" table indicating a baseline year of FFY 2018. Consistent with PRDE's proposed revision which OSEP accepted, the language should have stated that the baseline year in the "Historical Data" table should be revised to indicate a baseline year of FFY 2017. PRDE revised the "Historical Data" table to reflect that the baseline year for this indicator is FFY 2017.

**8 - OSEP Response**

OSEP notes that PRDE's reported FFY 2017 baseline data was 89.60% and the FFY 2019 target was 86.10%. OSEP cannot accept the target for this indicator because PRDE's end target does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. PRDE must revise its FFY 2019 target for this indicator to reflect improvement.

PRDE reported that the response data for this indicator was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, PRDE reported that the response group was representative of the population, rather than the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not the response data was representative. OSEP notes that PRDE did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

PRDE reported that sampling was used, but PRDE did not report whether its previously-approved sampling plan changed.

**8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**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))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

### 10 - Required Actions

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.99%	95.73%	96.51%	96.65%	97.99%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7,541	7,252	97.99%	100%	96.17%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage**

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. Despite PRDE facing this shorter timeline, PRDE ensured that 96.17% of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received in FFY 2019 had evaluations completed within 30 days.

PRDE has dedicated significant resources to ensuring compliance with this requirement and has shown significant and steady progress over the years. Since FFY 2013, PRDE consistently has achieved substantial compliance (>95%) with the Indicator 11 requirements. The data for FFY 2019 reflects slippage compared to FFY 2018 (decrease from 97.99% to 96.17%). This slippage is attributable to the unique challenges the school system faced during the 2019-2020 school year including a significant period of school closures due to both an unprecedented series of earthquakes in January 2020 and the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020.

Following Puerto Rico schools breaking for winter recess on December 20, 2019, the island was hit by an unprecedented sequence of earthquakes that continued for weeks keeping all public schools closed islandwide through January 27, 2020 and destroying some schools entirely. All PRDE schools and offices were closed until the safety of each building could be assessed and declared safe to resume operations. While some schools began to open January 28, many schools never had the chance to reopen before systemwide closures were mandated due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Puerto Rico schools were again shut down effective March 13, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remained closed the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year and are yet to re-open for in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year to date. Schools and offices were closed for a significant period of time, and activities related to completing evaluations were delayed as a natural result of such actions taken to protect the public health and safety. For example, certain appointments were initially delayed with hopes of being able to re-schedule for completion of necessary activities in-person. The adjustment to completing evaluations virtually required additional time and often may have led to delays and unique scheduling challenges.

Despite these challenges, PRDE staff and evaluation teams worked incredibly hard with students and their families to ensure compliance with the strict timeline. PRDE was able to ensure for FFY 2019 that 96.17% of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received were evaluated within 30 days and that 97.8% were evaluated within 60 days. PRDE remains committed to ensuring all children for whom parental consent to evaluate is received are evaluated within Puerto Rico's strict 30 day timeline.

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

289

**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.**

Below, PRDE presents the ranges of days within which FFY 2019 initial evaluations were held. It reflects the total number and percentages of FFY 2019 initial evaluations both within and beyond Puerto Rico's mandated 30 day timeline for completing an initial evaluation. For those 289 evaluations completed beyond the 30 day timeline, PRDE presents the number and percent of evaluations that were completed within several range of day groupings. Notably, 122 of the 289 evaluations at issue were completed within 31 to 60 days. This means that 97.8% of FFY 2019 evaluations were completed within the federal timeline of 60 days  $(7,252 + 122 / 7,541 = 97.8\%)$ .

- Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate = 7,541
- Eval. Within 30 days or less = 7,252
- Eval. Within 31-60 days = 122
- Eval. Within 61-90 days = 60
- Eval. Within 91-120 days = 22
- Eval. possibly in more than 120 days = 85

As reflected above, PRDE completed 97.8% of FFY 2019 initial evaluations (7,374) within 60 days, and 96.17% within Puerto Rico's stricter mandated 30 day timeline. Furthermore, PRDE has verified that 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate in FFY 2019 have received their evaluations.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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 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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

PRDE SAEE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2018, and PRDE SAEE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE SAEE accounted for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified: (a) through the State's on-site monitoring system (self-assessment) ; (b) through the review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through a State data system (MiPE); and (c) by the Department. For the record, PRDE again notes that it is a unitary system; as such, PRDE is the sole LEA on the island. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Specifically, Puerto Rico verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 (i.e., PRDE, the sole LEA on the island): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The finding was corrected within one year of identification.

For the first prong listed above ("is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements...based on a review of updated data"), the PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) 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, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301. Specifically, in reviewing initial evaluation data for a subsequent period of time, the MCU analyzed the number of days that passed between the date of parental consent for evaluation and the initial evaluation. Through this analysis, the MCU determined that 100% of the students in Puerto Rico for whom parental consent to evaluate was received during the subsequent period received their evaluation within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301.

For the second prong ("has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA"), PRDE reviewed the list of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was obtained between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019, but whose initial evaluation was not timely, and then checked to make sure that an evaluation was completed for each child on that list, unless the child was no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, although late, by looking at evidence of the completion of the evaluation (i.e., evaluation report) in each Student's file. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

**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 identification of noncompliance.

Specifically for this prong ("has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA"), as detailed in the above section as well, PRDE reviewed the list of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was obtained between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019, but whose initial evaluation was not timely, and then checked to make sure that an evaluation was completed for each child on that list, unless the child was no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, although late, by looking at evidence of the completion of the evaluation (i.e., evaluation report) in each Student's file.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # 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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	13.17%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.78%	96.03%	96.41%	97.11%	98.57%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,344
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	3

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	826
d. Number 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.	490
e. Number of children who were referred to 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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	826	851	98.57%	100%	97.06%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

For FFY 2019, the Indicator 12 data reflects that PRDE ensured that 97.06% of children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3, and found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

PRDE has dedicated significant resources to ensuring compliance with this requirement and has shown significant and steady progress over the years. Since FFY 2015, PRDE consistently has achieved substantial compliance (>95%) with the Indicator 12 requirements. The data for FFY 2019 reflects slippage compared to FFY 2018 (decrease from 98.57% to 97.06%). This slippage is attributable to the unique challenges the school system faced during the 2019-2020 school year including a significant period of school closures due to both an unprecedented series of earthquakes in January 2020 and the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020.

Following Puerto Rico schools breaking for winter recess on December 20, 2019, the island was hit by an unprecedented sequence of earthquakes that continued for weeks keeping all public schools closed islandwide through January 27, 2020 and destroying some schools entirely. All PRDE schools and offices were closed until the safety of each building could be assessed and declared safe to resume operations. While some schools began to open January 28, many schools never had the chance to reopen before systemwide closures were mandated due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Puerto Rico schools were again shut down effective March 13, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remained closed the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year and are yet to re-open for in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year to date.

Schools and offices were closed for a significant period of time, and activities related to completing evaluations were delayed as a natural result of such actions taken to protect the public health and safety. For example, certain appointments were initially delayed with hopes of being able to re-schedule for completion of necessary activities in-person. The adjustment to completing evaluations virtually required additional time and often may have led to delays and unique scheduling challenges.

Despite these challenges, PRDE staff and evaluation teams worked incredibly hard with children referred from Part B and their families to ensure a timely transition. PRDE was able to ensure for FFY 2019 that 97.06% of children referred by Part C and found eligible had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. PRDE remains committed to ensuring all children referred from Part C and are found eligible for Part B have an IEP developed and implemented timely, i.e., by their third birthdays.

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

25

**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 information presents the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of these 25 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Those 25 children represent just 0.02% of all children served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination during FFY 2019 (25/1,344). Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

# of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2019 and were not determined eligible or provided with services by their third birthday = 25

- In place within 30 days following third birthday = 8
- In place between 31 and 60 days of third birthday = 2
- In place between 61 and 90 days of third birthday = 0
- In place between 91 and 120 days of third birthday = 6
- In place more than 120 days following third birthday = 9

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. These challenges were exacerbated by the unique challenges the school system faced during the 2019-2020 school year including a significant period of school closures due to both an unprecedented series of earthquakes in January 2020 and the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, as discussed above with regard to reasons for slippage.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

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 2019, 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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

PRDE SAEE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2018, and PRDE SAEE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE SAEE accounted for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified: (a) through the State's on-site monitoring system (self-assessment); (b) through the review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through a State data system (MiPE); and (c) by the Department. For the record, PRDE again notes that it is a unitary system; as such, PRDE is the sole LEA on the island. PRDE’s determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Specifically, Puerto Rico verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 (i.e., PRDE, the sole LEA on the island): (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. The finding was corrected within one year of identification.

For the first prong listed above (“is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements...based on a review of updated data”), the PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) reviewed early childhood transition data for a subsequent period of time and ascertained that children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Specifically, in reviewing early childhood transition data for a subsequent period of time, the MCU analyzed documentation regarding the dates upon which each child referred from Part C prior to age 3 during the subsequent period received an evaluation, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented. Through this analysis, the MCU determined that 100% of those students in Puerto Rico who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 received their evaluations, and if determined eligible for Part B services, had an IEP developed and implemented by the time they turned 3 years old in accordance with the specific regulatory requirements.

For the second prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), PRDE reviewed the list of students for who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019 to make sure that all students were evaluated, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, even if late. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, IEP developed, and IEP implemented, even if late, by looking at student evaluation, IEP, and placement records. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

**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 identification of noncompliance.

Specifically for this prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), as detailed in the above section as well, PRDE reviewed the list of students for who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019 to make sure that all students were evaluated, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, even if late. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, IEP developed, and IEP implemented, even if late, by looking at student evaluation, IEP, and placement records.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Secondary transition: 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))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	88.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.63%	98.28%	96.37%	99.11%	99.06%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
7,790	7,962	99.06%	100%	97.84%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

PRDE has dedicated significant resources to ensuring compliance with this requirement and has shown significant and steady progress over the years. Since FFY 2014, PRDE consistently has achieved substantial compliance (>95%) with the Indicator 13 requirements. The data reflects minor slippage with Indicator 13 from FFY 2018 (99.11%) to FFY 2019 (97.84%), a decrease of 1.27 percentage points. While PRDE's data did not reach the mandated 100% target, the data reflect a very high rate of compliance (97.84%) that is above both the mean (89%) and the median (96.7%) of all states for 2018-2019.

This slippage is attributable to the unique challenges the school system faced during the 2019-2020 school year including a significant period of school closures due to both an unprecedented series of earthquakes in January 2020 and the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020. Following Puerto Rico schools breaking for winter recess on December 20, 2019, the island was hit by an unprecedented sequence of earthquakes that continued for weeks keeping all public schools closed islandwide through January 27, 2020 and destroying some schools entirely. All PRDE schools and offices were closed until the safety of each building could be assessed and declared safe to resume operations. While some schools began to open January 28, many schools never had the chance to reopen before systemwide closures were mandated due to the COVID-19 outbreak. Puerto Rico schools were again shut down effective March 13, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remained closed the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year and are yet to re-open for in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year to date.

Schools and offices were closed for a significant period of time, and activities related to reviewing and updating IEPs may have been delayed as a natural result of such actions taken to protect the public health and safety. For example, certain IEP team meetings may have been initially delayed with hopes of being able to re-schedule to meet in-person. The adjustment to working together and conducting meetings virtually required additional time and often may have led to delays and unique scheduling challenges.

Despite these challenges, PRDE was able to ensure for FFY 2019 that 97.84% compliance with Indicator 13 for FFY 2019.

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

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 2019, 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. During FFY 2019, the checklist was used for the review of all students age 16 and above as in past years. This was the third year during which information was collected through the MiPE system. PRDE SAEЕ 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 SAEЕ Transition Coordinators. SAEЕ 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 7,962 students age 16 and above. The information for this indicator was requested through MiPE in a timely manner in order to verify the data.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	7	1	0

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The PRDE SAEЕ Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) issued a finding of noncompliance with Indicator 13 to eight entities during FFY 2018, and PRDE has verified that all eight entities have corrected the noncompliance. PRDE was able to verify that seven of the eight entities corrected the noncompliance timely, within one year of identification.

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 post-secondary 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 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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: States 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

#### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

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. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	48.80%	49.00%	49.20%	49.40%	49.60%
A	48.00%	Data	62.14%	56.32%	57.46%	51.10%	59.16%
B	2009	Target >=	55.90%	56.00%	56.10%	56.20%	56.30%
B	55.30%	Data	66.37%	60.12%	69.83%	65.46%	68.74%
C	2009	Target >=	84.00%	84.80%	85.60%	86.40%	87.11%
C	87.10%	Data	84.42%	81.08%	84.58%	87.37%	83.82%

### FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	49.80%
Target B >=	56.40%
Target C >=	87.11%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

### FFY 2019 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	2,957
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,732
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	285
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)	371
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).	145

Measure	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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,732	2,957	59.16%	49.80%	58.57%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2,017	2,957	68.74%	56.40%	68.21%	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)	2,533	2,957	83.82%	87.11%	85.66%	Did Not Meet 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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

**Include the State's analyses 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 list notes the make-up of the target population and the response group by disability classification. For each disability category classification, the percentage make-up of the target population for that classification is listed followed by the percentage make-up of the response group for that classification.

Comparing Target Population % to Response Group % by IDEA Disability Category Classification:

Autism: 3.6%, 4.3%

Deaf-blindness: 0.0%, 0.0%

Emotional Disturbance: 2.1%, 2.2%

Hearing Impairment: 0.7%, 0.9%  
 Multiple Disabilities: 0.8%, 1.0%  
 Intellectual Disabilities: 6.8%, 5.5%  
 Other Health Impairment: 18.0%, 18.2%  
 Orthopedic Impairment: 0.1%, 0.2%  
 Specific Learning Disability: 64.1%, 64.2%  
 Speech or Language Impairment: 3.0%, 2.7%  
 Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.0%, 0.1%  
 Visual Impairment: 0.8%, 0.8%

Question	Yes / No
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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State proposed to revise the baseline for Indicator 14C, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide sufficient justification for the baseline change.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

**14 - OSEP Response**

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**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))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	420
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	170

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	50.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018

Target >=	52.50%	52.75%	53.00%	53.25%	53.50%
Data	65.44%	62.38%	59.00%	70.82%	27.78%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	50.01%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

<b>3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements</b>	<b>3.1 Number of resolutions sessions</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
170	420	27.78%	50.01%	40.48%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**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)))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$  divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	295
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	219
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Our stakeholder group established by the PR Law 51, 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, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, and others. SAEE 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. As we have established the stakeholder group has monthly meetings. It is important to establish that all public policies regarding COVID 19 were done with our stakeholder input. Also, the guides the secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing is with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR are discussed with stakeholders. They provided valuable comments as a diverse group of experts in special education such as the needs to develop guides and public policies on COVID 19, the limited access of parents for computers and internet. The stakeholders provide suggestions on how to improve the discussion for each indicator. 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 2019 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2019 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2019 data, targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	43.30%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	66.00%	66.25%	66.50%	66.75%	67.00%
Data	95.73%	94.09%	91.61%	89.70%	56.76%

**Targets**

FFY	2019
Target >=	56.76%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
219	0	295	56.76%	56.76%	74.24%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

**16 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

**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.**

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

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

#### **Title:**

PR Special Education Program Compliance Officer

#### **Email:**

carrionmdn@de.pr.gov

#### **Phone:**

787-380-6997

#### **Submitted on:**

04/29/21 2:55:00 PM