

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Puerto Rico



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**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 FFY 2020, the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) remained steadfastly committed in its work to carry out its mission of providing quality public education to students across Puerto Rico (PR) despite unique and incredibly challenging circumstances. To understand the challenges of the 2020-2021 school year (SY) in PR, it is important context to also have an understanding of what transpired over the prior year leading into SY 2020-2021. In this Executive Summary, we first review significant events impacting the FFY 2020 reporting period and then proceed to provide an overview of PRDE structure and organization.

During the FFY 2019 reporting period, PR 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 PR's history, 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 SY 2019-2020. Then, 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 (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, PRDE ordered the inspection of all schools prior to their opening of the second semester. This resulted in all PRDE schools and offices 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 school facilities were completed, the opening of the schools was ordered by phases beginning January 28, 2020. While some schools began to open January 28, 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. The PRDE Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs by their Spanish acronym) continued to operate and provide services to the special education population.

Less than two months after schools began reopening from the earthquake closures, PR schools were again shut down effective March 14, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remained closed the remainder of SY 2019-2020, and PRDE did not resume the educational curriculum until SY 2020-2021.

While PRDE resumed the educational curriculum at the start of SY 2020-2021, PR schools remained physically closed for the far majority of that school year. During SY 2020-2021, virtual programming was provided. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, PR experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all schools islandwide were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021. Only a small group of schools reopened for in-person learning in early May 2021 until the end of the school year the first week of June 2021.

Faced with great challenges and assuming our constitutional responsibility, PRDE made adjustments to continue leading the teaching-learning process during SY 2020-2021. 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 allowed each family multiple options for continuing virtual learning. 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 held mandatory virtual learning schools with TEAMS. These trainings were available on different schedules to best accommodate teacher availability. SAEE's responded so that the staff of the CSEEs could use 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 which will then be counted as part of the cumulative scores. SAEE reviewed the modules and formatted them so the reader programs could benefit blind students. Guidelines were issued for teachers including special education teachers who must be modifying and adapting available materials to support their students.

PRDE continues to operate as a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in PR. 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 PR 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 eliminated the then-existing 28 School Districts, but maintained and worked to strengthen the seven previously existing educational regions. 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 ORE 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), and complementary curriculum (e.g., Social Studies, Health, Phys. Educ., Arts, Vocational Studies and Special Educ.). 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 CSEEs). School Officer is in charge of providing support to the School Directors (Principals). Accountability Unit is responsible for work related to the PR 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, school transportation, and security. Human Resources personnel hiring, professional development and personnel evaluation. Legal Division Unit oversees and manages legal issues and complaints, including 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 developed modules to collect the majority of the OSEP APR Indicators thought 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. The TAU personnel are assigned to support each of the 7 Regional Educational Offices (OREs), 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 2020-2021 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 SAEE 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 SAEE 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 children with disabilities.

Herein, we describe the professional development system and related efforts provided during the school year 2020-2021. 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 SAEE which gives them the knowledge to provide the technical assistance. Regarding the professional development related to post secondary transition, the SAEE 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 SAEE 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 it is been implemented in PR the Leader in the SAEE is a well recognized Psychologist in PR. For the services for deaf blind and blind student populations, the SAEE 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 attend the needs of the PR students with IEPs who would receive educational services in special education classroom.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

7

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Parent members, representatives from the parent engagement organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities) (APNI), and advocacy groups and advisory committees participate with our stakeholder group, the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial ("Special Education Advisory Committee"), as discussed above. Additionally, the committee shares information discussed with other

parents and parent groups across Puerto Rico. As mentioned above, monthly meetings are held, and the APR Indicators have been discussed with them, including setting targets, analyzing data, and developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

PRDE regularly holds activities that are designed to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. During the FFY 2020 reporting period, PRDE sponsored orientations and workshops aiming to increase capacity of parents and improve outcomes for children with disabilities around a wide array of topics including use of technology, COVID-19 protocols and the virtual learning environment, PBIS, social emotional learning, management of emotions, post-secondary transition, and equitable services.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As discussed above, PRDE holds monthly meetings with its stakeholder groups. As meetings are held throughout the year, input is received on APR matters including setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The APR is developed in consultation with the stakeholder group, including target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation. The draft APR is reviewed with the stakeholder group and feedback and recommendations are incorporated prior to final submission by the February 1, 2022 deadline. The stakeholder committee is apprised of the clarifications process and consulted as necessary. PRDE publishes copies of its SPP/APR on its website as noted below.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

PRDE has had a copy of its FFY 2019 SPP/APR as well as prior SPP/APRs available on its website at: <https://de.pr.gov/educacion-especial/cumplimiento>. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR can be directly accessed at: <https://de.pr.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/pr-01-spp-part-b-ffy-2019-20-1310-20210429145513-after-clarification.pdf>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In PRDE's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised PRDE of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required PRDE to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed PRDE 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. PRDE must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which PRDE received assistance; and (2) the actions PRDE took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

During the FFY 2020 and since the issuance of OSEP's determinations on June 24, 2021, PRDE SAEE received technical assistance from outside sources such as USDE-funded technical assistance centers including NCSI, IDC (IDEA Data Center), CIFR, and NIMAC. PRDE SAEE worked with NCSI to receive guidance around provision of services during the COVID-19 pandemic, which aid PRDE with ensuring the provision of FAPE for students in educational placements reflected in Indicators 5 and 6. PRDE also received assistance from IDC regarding IDEA data collection and the COVID-19 pandemic as well as regarding changes to the SPP/APR and related data needs. PRDE SAEE continued participation with the CIFR Communities of Practices-Southeast. Additionally, PRDE has participated in OSEP's monthly technical assistance webinars and in monthly meetings with its OSEP contact. Additionally, PRDE has been working with the Puerto Rico Educational Sustainability Team (PRES Team) from the United States Department of Education, including OSEP representatives, to address various technical assistance matters with a goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

PRDE's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed PRDE that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

The Department and OSEP have imposed Specific Conditions on PRDE's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

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) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	66.93%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	56.70%	56.80%	56.90%	57.00%	70.99%
Data	72.55%	80.12%	70.99%	70.98%	67.79%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,740
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	198
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	141
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	984

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,740	6,063	67.79%	60.00%	78.18%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The requirement of PRDE is 24 credits to graduate with a regular high school diploma (Circular letter Number 34-2016-2017).

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)

For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Indicator 1 requires a change in the data source and calculation compared to prior years. Additionally, Indicator 1 requires data be reported for the year before the APR reporting year. As such, the data reported for the FFY 2020 APR correspond to school year 2019-2020. In light of the new methodology, Puerto Rico, in consultation with stakeholders, carefully considered impact of the new methodology on its data for Indicator 1 over several years. Additionally, there was significant discussion of potential impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in Puerto Rico and impact on exiting data. In light of these considerations, Puerto Rico proposes establishing its new baseline for Indicator 1 by applying the new methodology to the applicable data for its current baseline year, 2018. Accordingly, applying the new methodology to the exiting data for the FY 2018 APR data, PRDE's 2018 baseline data is 66.93% ($4736/7076 = 66.93\%$).

While the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 may have impacted 2019-2020 data, we anticipate further impacts due to the pandemic for 2020-2021. As discussed in the introduction to PRDE's FY 2020 APR, PRDE schools operated virtually for essentially the entire 2020-2021 school year. After initially being shut down effective March 14, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Puerto Rico schools remained physically closed for the majority of the 2020-2021 school year. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, Puerto Rico experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all schools islandwide were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021 and remained closed for in-person learning for the remainder of the 2020-2021 school year.

In light of the timing of the new methodology coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic, PRDE plans to closely monitor exiting data and consider, in consultation with stakeholders, whether future revisions to its Indicator 1 baseline and targets may be appropriate.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

PRDE has revised the baseline for this indicator, using the FFY 2018 IDEA section 618 exiting data, and OSEP accepts that revision.

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	43.36%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	35.00%	34.50%	34.00%	33.50%	33.00%
Data	33.92%	32.34%	25.46%	24.80%	23.11%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	32.00%	30.00%	28.00%	27.00%	26.00%	25.00%

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,740
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	198
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	141
SY 2019-20 Existing Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	984

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
984	6,063	23.11%	32.00%	16.23%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

While the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 may have impacted 2019-2020 data, we anticipate further impacts due to the pandemic for 2020-2021. As discussed in the introduction to PRDE's FY 2020 APR, PRDE schools operated virtually for essentially the entire 2020-2021 school year. After initially being shut down effective March 14, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Puerto Rico schools remained physically closed for the majority of the 2020-2021 school year. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, Puerto Rico experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all schools islandwide were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021 and remained closed for in-person learning for the remainder of the 2020-2021 school year. In light of these considerations, PRDE plans to closely monitor exiting data and consider, in continued consultation with stakeholders, whether future revisions to its Indicator 2 baseline and targets may be appropriate.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4		
Reading	B	Grade 8		
Reading	C	Grade HS		
Math	A	Grade 4		
Math	B	Grade 8		
Math	C	Grade HS		

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4						
Reading	B >=	Grade 8						
Reading	C >=	Grade HS						
Math	A >=	Grade 4						
Math	B >=	Grade 8						
Math	C >=	Grade HS						

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the pre-filled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS						N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS						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 the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for this indicator in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. Following administration of the statewide assessments for the 2021-2022 school year, PRDE will analyze data in consultation with stakeholders in order to set targets through FFY 2025 and establish new baseline data, as appropriate, for Indicator 3.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - 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 2020 data for this indicator.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4		
Reading	B	Grade 8		
Reading	C	Grade HS		
Math	A	Grade 4		
Math	B	Grade 8		
Math	C	Grade HS		

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4						
Reading	B >=	Grade 8						
Reading	C >=	Grade HS						
Math	A >=	Grade 4						
Math	B >=	Grade 8						
Math	C >=	Grade HS						

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Gr ou p	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS						N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS						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 the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for this indicator in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. Following administration of the statewide assessments for the 2021-2022 school year, PRDE will analyze data in consultation with stakeholders in order to set targets through FFY 2025 and establish new baseline data, as appropriate, for Indicator 3.

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 2020 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4		
Reading	B	Grade 8		
Reading	C	Grade HS		
Math	A	Grade 4		
Math	B	Grade 8		
Math	C	Grade HS		

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4						
Reading	B >=	Grade 8						
Reading	C >=	Grade HS						
Math	A >=	Grade 4						
Math	B >=	Grade 8						
Math	C >=	Grade HS						

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS						N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8						N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS						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 the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for this indicator in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. Following administration of the statewide assessments for the 2021-2022 school year, PRDE will analyze data in consultation with stakeholders in order to set targets through FFY 2025 and establish new baseline data, as appropriate, for Indicator 3.

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 2020 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4		
Reading	B	Grade 8		
Reading	C	Grade HS		
Math	A	Grade 4		
Math	B	Grade 8		
Math	C	Grade HS		

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4						
Reading	B <=	Grade 8						
Reading	C <=	Grade HS						
Math	A <=	Grade 4						
Math	B <=	Grade 8						
Math	C <=	Grade HS						

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with

the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
---	--	--	--

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	
B	Grade 8						N/A	
C	Grade HS						N/A	

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4						N/A	
B	Grade 8						N/A	
C	Grade HS						N/A	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for this indicator in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. Following administration of the statewide assessments for the 2021-2022 school year, PRDE will analyze data in consultation with stakeholders in order to set targets through FFY 2025 and establish new baseline data, as appropriate, for Indicator 3.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - 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 2020 data for this indicator.

3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%
Data		0.00%	0.00%		

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

7

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
	0		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))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

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, PRDE began comparing the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 7 OREs (although they are not LEAs) beginning with the FFY 2018 APR submission.

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 2020 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 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2019

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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes that PRDE reported it compared the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA to nondisabled children in the same LEA. However, in its narrative PRDE reported it elected to "compare the rates of children with disabilities suspended or expelled among districts, although they are not LEAs as defined under the IDEA." PRDE must clarify which comparison methodology it is using to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 = $\frac{[(\# \text{ of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (\# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)]}{times 100}}$

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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**4B- Required Actions**

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	77.00%	77.33%	77.67%	77.85%	67.25%
A	67.74%	Data	70.26%	76.27%	72.09%	67.24%	67.74%
B	2019	Target <=	7.20%	6.70%	6.20%	5.70%	8.93%
B	9.43%	Data	6.94%	8.64%	9.22%	8.94%	9.43%
C	2019	Target <=	3.60%	3.40%	3.20%	3.00%	3.00%
C	1.72%	Data	2.75%	2.30%	2.23%	1.83%	1.72%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	67.75%	67.80%	67.85%	67.90%	67.95%	68.00%
Target B <=	9.65%	9.60%	9.55%	9.50%	9.45%	9.40%
Target C <=	2.50%	2.40%	2.30%	2.20%	2.10%	1.71%

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	89,752
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70,892
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,863
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,141
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	1
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	353

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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70,892	89,752	67.74%	67.75%	78.99%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7,863	89,752	9.43%	9.65%	8.76%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,495	89,752	1.72%	2.50%	1.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). 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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
A	Data	79.35%	78.46%	79.21%	86.12%	81.82%
B	Target <=	0.73%	0.72%	0.71%	0.70%	0.70%
B	Data	0.35%	0.19%	0.20%	0.23%	0.15%

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	81.82%
B	2019	0.15%
C	2020	0.40%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.83%
Target B <=	0.70%	0.60%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%	0.14%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.80%	0.70%	0.60%	0.50%	0.45%	0.39%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	1,602	3,718	1,847	7,167
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	975	3,148	1,724	5,847
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	4	4	10	18
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	13	9	7	29

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

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	5,847	7,167	81.82%	79.00%	81.58%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	18	7,167	0.15%	0.70%	0.25%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	29	7,167		0.80%	0.40%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

PRDE has established a baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	94.11%	94.11%
A1	94.10%	Data	90.51%	90.93%	83.17%	73.02%	38.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%	58.20%	56.01%

A2	56.00%	Data	66.27%	49.55%	52.33%	42.81%	49.81%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.20%	86.40%	86.60%	89.71%	89.71%
B1	89.70%	Data	89.76%	89.29%	80.00%	67.85%	39.67%
B2	2008	Target >=	49.80%	50.00%	50.20%	50.40%	48.81%
B2	48.80%	Data	61.87%	44.28%	43.19%	31.64%	41.90%
C1	2008	Target >=	91.40%	91.60%	91.80%	95.51%	95.51%
C1	95.50%	Data	92.79%	94.10%	85.06%	75.76%	40.88%
C2	2008	Target >=	69.70%	69.80%	69.90%	72.21%	72.21%
C2	72.20%	Data	73.63%	53.61%	56.74%	47.29%	55.99%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	60.00%	65.00%	94.11%
Target A2 >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	56.01%
Target B1 >=	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	59.00%	64.00%	89.71%
Target B2 >=	39.00%	39.25%	39.50%	40.00%	45.00%	48.81%
Target C1 >=	45.00%	51.00%	57.00%	63.00%	70.00%	95.51%
Target C2 >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	55.00%	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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4,241

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	358	8.44%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,142	26.93%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	596	14.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	711	16.76%

Outcome A Progress Category					Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers					1,434	33.81%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,307	2,807	38.00%	45.00%	46.56%	Met target	No 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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,145	4,241	49.81%	50.00%	50.58%	Met 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			339	7.99%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers			1,323	31.20%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it			798	18.82%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers			856	20.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers			925	21.81%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,654	3,316	39.67%	45.00%	49.88%	Met target	No 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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,781	4,241	41.90%	39.00%	41.99%	Met 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			383	9.03%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,039	24.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	638	15.04%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	853	20.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,328	31.31%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	1,491	2,913	40.88%	45.00%	51.18%	Met target	No 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>	2,181	4,241	55.99%	50.00%	51.43%	Met target	No Slippage

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

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

PRDE did not report the number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis.

In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	86.09%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	86.70%	87.70%	88.70%	86.10%	86.10%
Data	81.62%	84.75%	86.09%	86.15%	82.35%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%	86.00%	86.10%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
311	360	82.35%	84.00%	86.39%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

383

Percentage of respondent parents

93.99%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	57.70%	93.99%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

PRDE will closely monitor progress with obtaining responses, assess response rate at regular intervals, and use multiple forms of follow-up in effort to continuously improve the response rate, particularly for those groups that may have been identified as underrepresented.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

As noted below, PRDE's analysis of the response data reflected that the data is representative of the demographics of the children for whom parents responded. PRDE analyzed the response rate, and no nonresponse bias was identified.

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

PRDE analyzed respondent data and determined the demographics of the children for whom parents responded was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. The response group accurately reflects the target population. The following list notes the make-up of the target population and the response group by geographic educational region of the children for whom parents responded. For each of the seven geographical regions, the percentage make-up of the target population is listed followed by the percentage make-up of the response group for the educational region.

Comparing Target Population % to Response Group % by PRDE Educational Region

1. ARECIBO 14.0%; 14.7%
2. BAYAMON 15.6%; 15.6%
3. CAGUAS 14.2%; 15.3%

4. HUMACAO 10.3%; 11.1%
 5. MAYAGUEZ 14.8%; 11.1%
 6. PONCE 13.5%; 14.4%
 7. SAN JUAN 17.6%; 17.8%

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.
 (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/-4% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
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.

As noted above, PRDE uses a previously approved sampling plan which has not changed. PRDE submitted its sampling plan along with its revised IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR) on February 1, 2007. As detailed with that submission in PRDE's FFY 2005 APR discussion of Indicator 8, the random sampling methodology used is based on Vera (2005) and Cornett & Beckner (1975). A copy of the sampling plan was included as an attachment to the FFY 2005 APR, and that previously submitted document is being provided as an attachment to this FFY 2020 APR as requested by OSEP. On June 15, 2007, OSEP issued its APR determination letter to PRDE along with an enclosed table providing OSEP's analysis of PRDE's FFY 2005 APR and revised SPP. Therein, in the column discussing 'OSEP Analysis/Next Steps' related to Indicator 8, OSEP stated, "Puerto Rico has submitted a sampling plan that has been approved."

Applying that sampling plan, a random selection of parents was used for survey administration. As PRDE's special education population for FFY 2020 was 96,919 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2020-2021. Determination of the required sample was defined by applying the methodology of the previously approved sampling plan discussed above. That formula is:

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

Where:

s = required sample size

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

N = population size

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

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

Accordingly, with a universe/population size (N) of 96,919:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= [(3.841)(96,919)(.50)(1-.50)] / [(.05)(.05)(96,919-1) + (3.841)(.50)(1-.50)] \\ &= [(372,265.879)(.50)(1-.50)] / [(.0025)(96,918) + 1.9205(.50)] \\ &= [186,132.94](.50) / [242.295 + .96025] \\ &= [93,066.4698] / [243.25525] \\ &= 382.59 \\ s &= 383 \text{ parents} \end{aligned}$$

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

PRDE reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator but did not report whether its previously approved sampling plan had changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, PRDE must submit its sampling plan to OSEP and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan

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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.20%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.73%	96.51%	96.65%	97.99%	96.17%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6,794	6,702	96.17%	100%	98.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

92

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 2020 initial evaluations were held. It reflects the total number and percentages of FFY 2020 initial evaluations both within and beyond Puerto Rico's mandated 30 day timeline for completing an initial evaluation. For those 92 evaluations completed beyond the 30 day timeline, PRDE presents the number and percent of evaluations that were completed within several range of day groupings. Reasons for the delays include data entry errors, parent failure to keep scheduled appointments, or situations causing meetings to be rescheduled due to unavailability of a required party. Notably, 79 of the 92 evaluations at issue were completed within 31 to 60 days. This means that 99.8% of FFY 2020 evaluations were completed within the federal timeline of 60 days ($6,702 + 79 / 6,794 = 99.8\%$).

Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate = 6,794

Eval. Within 30 days or less = 6,702

Eval. Within 31-60 days = 79

Eval. Within 61-90 days = 7

Eval. Within 91-120 days = 2

Eval. possibly in more than 120 days = 4

As reflected above, PRDE completed 99.8% of FFY 2020 initial evaluations (6,781) within 60 days, and 98.65% within Puerto Rico's stricter mandated 30 day timeline. Furthermore, PRDE has verified that 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate in FFY 2020 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 2019

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

FFY 2019 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 six findings of noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2019, and PRDE SAEE has ensured timely correction of each of the six findings 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 2019 (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, 2019 and June 30, 2020, 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, 2019 and June 30, 2020, 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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

PRDE did not report the reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 30 days (the State-established timeline) of receiving parental consent for the evaluation.

In its description of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, PRDE referenced the incorrect fiscal year. Specifically, PRDE reported, "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..." As a result, PRDE did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, PRDE did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	13.17%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.03%	96.41%	97.11%	98.57%	97.06%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,421
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	6

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	905
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.	480
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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	905	935	97.06%	100%	96.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

30

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 30 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Those 30 children represent just 2.1% of all children served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination during FFY 2020 (30/1,421). Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2020 and were not determined eligible or provided with services by their third birthday = 30

In place within 30 days following third birthday = 11
 In place between 31 and 60 days of third birthday = 2
 In place between 61 and 90 days of third birthday = 6
 In place between 91 and 120 days of third birthday = 5
 In place more than 120 days following third birthday = 6

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 2020-2021 school year due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 2020, 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 2019

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 2019 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 2019, 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 2019 (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, 2019 and June 30, 2020 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, 2019 and June 30, 2020 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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, PRDE referenced an incorrect year. "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." As a result, PRDE did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, PRDE did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	88.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.28%	96.37%	99.11%	99.06%	97.84%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
13,639	13,972	97.84%	100%	97.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 2020, 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 2020, the checklist was used for the review of all students age 16 and above as in past years. This was the fourth year during which information was collected through the MiPE system. PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B13 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published. Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the checklist. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this checklist in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation. Special Education School Teachers were in charge of reviewing the files and initially completing the transition checklist for this indicator, in coordination with the SAEE Transition Coordinators. SAEE Transition Coordinators were in charge of training staff and monitoring the use of the checklist. Transition Coordinators are also involved in the IEP development and revision process. In total, PRDE reviewed the files of 13,972 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 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	1	2	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) issued a finding of noncompliance with Indicator 13 to three entities during FFY 2019, and PRDE has verified that all three entities have corrected the noncompliance. PRDE was able to verify that one of the three 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 service 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 service 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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In

the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	49.00%	49.20%	49.40%	49.60%	49.80%
A	48.00%	Data	56.32%	57.46%	51.10%	59.16%	58.57%
B	2009	Target >=	56.00%	56.10%	56.20%	56.30%	56.40%
B	55.30%	Data	60.12%	69.83%	65.46%	68.74%	68.21%
C	2009	Target >=	84.80%	85.60%	86.40%	87.11%	87.11%
C	87.10%	Data	81.08%	84.58%	87.37%	83.82%	85.66%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	48.50%	48.70%	48.90%	50.10%	50.30%	50.50%
Target B >=	57.00%	58.00%	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%	60.00%
Target C >=	81.00%	81.20%	81.40%	81.60%	81.80%	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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with

the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	6,063
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,380
Response Rate	55.75%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,651
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	653
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)	345
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).	93

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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,651	3,380	58.57%	48.50%	48.85%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	2,304	3,380	68.21%	57.00%	68.17%	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)	2,742	3,380	85.66%	81.00%	81.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	69.36%	55.75%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

PRDE will closely monitor progress with obtaining responses, assess response rate at regular intervals, and use multiple forms of follow-up in effort to continuously improve the response rate.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

As noted below, PRDE analysis of the response data reflect that the data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school. PRDE analyzed the response rate, and no nonresponse bias was identified.

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: 3.4%, 3.9%
 Deaf-blindness: 0.0%, 0.0%
 Emotional Disturbance: 1.5%, 1.3%
 Hearing Impairment: 0.6%, 0.7%
 Multiple Disabilities: 0.6%, 0.7%
 Intellectual Disabilities: 6.4%, 5.0%
 Other Health Impairment: 20.8%, 21.8%
 Orthopedic Impairment: 0.2%, 0.2%
 Specific Learning Disability: 63.1%, 62.7%
 Speech or Language Impairment: 2.7%, 2.8%
 Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.0%, 0.1%
 Visual Impairment: 0.6%, 0.8%

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/- 4% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 EDFacts 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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	405
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	249

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	50.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	52.75%	53.00%	53.25%	53.50%	50.01%
Data	62.38%	59.00%	70.82%	27.78%	40.48%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	50.00%	50.10%	50.00%	50.30%	50.40%	50.50%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
249	405	40.48%	50.00%	61.48%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1 \text{ times } 100.$

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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	125
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	102
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	43.30%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	66.25%	66.50%	66.75%	67.00%	56.76%
Data	94.09%	91.61%	89.70%	56.76%	74.24%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	57.00%	57.10%	57.20%	57.30%	57.40%	57.50%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
102	0	125	74.24%	57.00%	81.60%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

PRDE provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider behaviors, parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

PRDE's State Identified Measurable Results (SiMR) criteria is to increase the percentage (%) of special education students in the 5th grade who score proficient or advanced on the math regular assessment in the participating schools (all elementary schools from the former Yabucoa School District). PRDE's SiMR is aligned in accordance with APR Indicator 3 and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment System, called Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico (META-PR).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

PRDE's theory of action has not changed. A copy of PRDE's Theory of Action is available in the following link: https://compascgcom-my.sharepoint.com/:b/g/personal/yayala_compascg_com/ETpLBby90XtDr9RYPreVHT8B24zHQm23hevblKBND070LQ?e=tSff9m

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
FFY 2015	27.63%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	27.68%	27.73%	27.78%	27.83%	27.88%	27.93%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

		FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
			27.68%		N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data source to be used would come from SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups – Math (EDFacts file spec FS175). Data for FFY 2020, however, is not available due to the waiver that was granted for the administration of the statewide assessments in Puerto Rico that normally would have been administered in spring 2021.

Due to the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for Indicator 3 in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. The waiver of this requirement represents a significant impact for the data presented in this report.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

PRDE's SiMR is aligned in accordance with APR Indicator 3 and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment System, called Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico (META-PR). Once the assessment is administered, the results are received from the PRDE Planning Office. PRDE Central Level performs its data analysis by identifying the schools within the SiMR, specifically their 5th grade student performance on META-PR in mathematics.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

For the second consecutive year (FFYs 2019 ad 2020), PRDE's statewide assessment was not administered due to the global pandemic, and as such, assessment data for this indicator was not available. For each year, PRDE was issued a waiver of the applicable statewide assessment requirements. As discussed in Puerto Rico's FFY 2019 SSIP submission, the U.S. Secretary of Education invited states to apply for waivers of the FFY 2019 statewide administration of assessments and certain accountability provisions of ESEA due to widespread school closures related to COVID-19. All states, including Puerto Rico, requested and were granted waivers.

In Puerto Rico, schools remained closed not only for the remainder of SY 2019-2020 but also for the far majority of SY 2020-2021. During SY 2020-2021, virtual programming was provided. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, PR experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all schools islandwide were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021. Only a small group of schools reopened for in-person learning in early May 2021 until the end of the school year the first week of June 2021.

Specific to the FFY 2020 reporting period, PRDE was granted a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year by letter dated August 27, 2021. A copy of the August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for Indicator 3 in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. The waiver of this requirement represents a significant impact for the data presented in this report.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://compascgcom-my.sharepoint.com/:b/g/personal/yayala_compascg_com/Ee0ZhRQXQ8tLk84u9zYYxtsBhB_Sv9X7Hv376rQiT4F4dg?e=MygJVq

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Even with the challenges and difficulties faced during this period, PRDE was able to continue with the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies. The first strategy is to provide Professional development activities for teachers who served students with disabilities. The professional development activities offered during FFY 2020 were based on the needs studies carried out by the schools.

The second is the communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education. To increase communication between the teachers from the general education classroom and special education, PRDE continues to implement professional learning communities based on strategies within curriculum implementation for all participating schools. During this period, increased communication between general education and special education teachers was promoted through the professional activities provided at the schools.

The third is the schools utilizing databased strategies in making educational decisions. One of the strategies established for the PRDE, previously mentioned in the EBP's section, is data driven decision making. The purpose of this strategy was to provide the necessary tools in order for the school to use data for decision making. The data analysis derive from META-PR allows the school director to prepare plans to address the deficiencies of their students. Despite the fact that META-PR is not reported for this period, it continues to be an SSIP strategy and evaluation component; it has been used in previous reporting periods and it will continue to be used in school year 2021-2022.

The fourth strategy is that PRDE Special Education Program continues the alignment with the initiatives related to improve the academic performance such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). During the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE determined one area of focus would be the implementation of PBIS. Despite the impact hurricanes Irma and Maria had on the island, including the school system shutdown for several months, recovery and reconstruction efforts that impacted many schools, the PBIS work plan began to be executed by Spring of 2018. Through it, the PRDE sought to prevent and manage inappropriate behaviors that influence school climate, in order to foster positive environment conducive to learning and to increase student achievement. The PBIS system is an important resource for the progress of the SSIP, since it trains teachers and other school personnel on how to implement evidence-based practices.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

As done in previous years, PRDE integrated different components to evaluate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies. For one, PRDE collected the data of the grades of the 5th grade students from the participating schools from the SSIP. The academic progress of the students provides information on the individual growth. This gives the opportunity to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions provided and identify any deficiency. The results of the analysis of the students in the 5th grade of the participating schools scoring "A's, B's or C's" in Math courses in a school year basis are presented below:

2015-2016: 81%
2016-2017: 60%
2017-2018: 67%
2018-2019: 82%
2019-2020: 91%
2020-2021: 82%

The data shows that 60% or more of the 5th grade students in the participating schools obtained an A, B or C in the yearly progress report for math for the last 6 school years. When comparing the data from one period to another, the last few school years show the highest percentage of students obtaining grades of A, B or C. It is important to point out the improvement of 15% shown from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.

This data suggests that the improvement strategies established by the SSIP are working and producing the expected results. The percentage of students who obtained A, B and C during FFY 2019 is the highest reported compared to all FFYs since PRDE began analyzing this data for the SSIP in FFY 2015.

With regard to FFY 2020, it is important to note that the 2020-2021 SY was significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic whereas nearly the entire school year was conducted virtually. Additionally, it is also important to note that prior to SY 2020-2021, there were a significantly smaller number of participating schools in the SSIP. Specifically, there were only three participating schools in prior years where as for SY 2020-2021, there were a total of 24 schools.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

PRDE will continue to implement the above-mentioned improvement strategies during the FFY 2021 reporting period.

1. The professional development activities for teachers will have to focus on virtual teaching with emphasis on math. Including specific coaching of the use of items available at home as a tool for differentiated instruction.
2. Regarding the strengthening of communication between teachers for FFY 2021, it is expected that all special education and math teachers received the same professional development and as much as possible include both teachers in the coaching sessions.
3. By using the data-driven decision-making strategy, teachers can identify the needs of their students and implement differentiated instruction. This will be achieved with the results of the PR assessment.
4. PRDE SAEE will continue to align with the PBIS implementation in the participating schools.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

PRDE has selected the evidence-based practices (EBPs) presented in its ESSA Plan. For math, which is our focus in the SiMR, PRDE established the following EBPs since Phase II to address the individual needs for students with disabilities: concept development, integration of technology, contextualized instruction, problem-based learning (PBL), curriculum integration and research in action, differentiated instruction and focus on problem-solving. Other strategies that were used by the schools are: an extended learning time program, job embedded professional development plan, parent and community involvement strategy, coaching and data driven decision making.

As in previous years, the EBPs for FFY 2020-2021 included professional development for both general and special education teachers with regard to serving students with disabilities that address the concerns identified in the schools needs assessment. These professional development activities are designed to provide educators with evidence-based tools and resources that promote effective instruction. The knowledge and skills gained through these opportunities will strengthen the quality of the teaching and learning process in the classroom to result in improved student achievement. To

ensure the implementation of best practices for the period included in this report, PRDE, through the Technical Assistance Unit (TAU), provided professional development regarding communities of practice, data analysis activities and PRDE Central Level trainings regarding policy through virtual modules.

Also, coaching strategy was used during FFY 2020 to reinforce the skills and knowledge of teachers to improve the teaching-learning process and is usually implemented through the support of the external provider. Each coach has the expertise to provide instruction by core subject area, including mathematics and special education. Some of the activities given by the external provider are:

- Mentoring and coaching to the special education teacher to provide coaching regarding the use of standards, and curricular framework in math.
- Assisting the teacher in the design of various assessment methods to identify students' needs.
- Coaching to support teachers' communication in the development of math exercises.
- Coaching to the math teacher in order to reinforce the understanding and application of academic standards, the use of curricular frameworks and curricular materials to develop an effective teaching-learning process for special education students.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

- Schools are using evidence-based strategies to promote math interventions for high-risk students, in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade so they will not fall behind. Math reading comprehension activities and explicit instruction are being implemented. Also, neuroeducation is being used to promote learning.
- School community with a common language to promote the implementation of the response to intervention system.
- Compliance with differentiated instruction.
- Opportunities for socio-emotional learning for students in times of crisis, integrated to the math class.
- Educational community trained to integrate trauma-based approaches and promote self-care in times of Covid -19.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Since Phase II, PRDE established the following EBPs to address the individual needs for students with disabilities: concept development, integration of technology, contextualized instruction, problem-based learning (PBL), curriculum integration and research in action, differentiated instruction and focus on problem-solving. Other strategies that were used by the schools are: an extended learning time program, job embedded professional development plan, parent and community involvement strategy, coaching and data driven decision making.

The EBPs that a school implements are established in the School Improvement Plan (DEE, per its acronym in Spanish). In this plan, the school establishes the activities and interventions that will be developing during the school year in order to improve the academic achievement of its students impacting the SiMR.

As a long-term goal PRDE expects to see the following impacts:

1. Teachers gain in knowledge
2. Improved academic achievement of special education students.
3. Reduction in academic gaps between the special education subgroup and all students.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

During FFY 2020, PRDE continued to use different platforms to ensure and demonstrate the fidelity of implementation. Specifically, the Student Information System (SIE by its acronym in Spanish), school improvement plan (DEE, by its acronym in Spanish), ? PCS (Follow-up and Compliance Portal, formerly known as SAMA) and Dashboards. With data obtained from these platforms, PRDE SAEE can evaluate the fidelity and effectiveness of the interventions provided and identify any deficiency. One of the data analysis made was the results of the students in the 5th grades at the participating schools scoring "A's, B's or C's" in Math. During the FFY 2020, 82% of the students scored "A's, B's or C's". In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies implemented as part of the SSIP in the performance and execution of the teachers, PRDE decided to use the results of the evaluations made for third, fourth and fifth grade teachers of the participating schools conducted through the PRDE Teacher Evaluation System. The data analyzed for FFY 2020 presents that the 90% of the teachers evaluated had an exemplary level of performance and 10% showed an competent level of performance.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The program evaluated the level of knowledge transfer from math teachers to their classrooms and how they applied educational strategies learned. Below we include a detail of the results. A representative sample of 55 participants was used.

Report of academic achievements, in the implementation of evidence-based practice models: RTI- Explicit Instruction in math, Realistic Mathematics, Technology Integration and Differentiated Instruction- Level of Knowledge transfer to the Classroom

Write down an example of compliance data on why it is in progress, or why it has not been implemented

1. I provide explicit, direct, systematic, and sequential instruction

85% - review the concepts

- I offer complete, explicit, and demonstrative instructions with examples
- I offer the student an example of how to do things, I explain and show them if necessary.
- Clear instructions, repeat them and ensure they were understood

2. I work on the instructional design considering scaffolding, meaningful learning, learning styles, and differentiated instruction to meet the students' learning challenge

75% - look for varied exercises to meet the learning styles

- I go from the simplest to the most complex considering what they know and what they don't. Considering the multiple intelligences.

• Written instructions and examples are offered in addition to a rubric.

- As a Special Education teacher, I work individually and explain each task for the student's understanding.

3. I give students a solid conceptual base. Procedures are taught. Sequence and work analysis is considered important.

65%-The concepts or skills are assigned in the curriculum; the teacher must comply with his teaching always considering the particularity of each group and student as an individual entity.

-For the teaching of each concept there must be a motivation, a meaning and a result. So, everything will depend on the design of the teaching plan of each individual teacher and how they carry it out in the classroom. In my particular case, this is what I make clear.

-I am faithful to the methodologies, the strategy process and its IDC, seeking to complete the teaching properly, responding to their learning style and individuality.

- Every time I present a skill, I try not to leave the student with doubts.

- Parents, as students are at home, are not collaborating with students in an appropriate way. I understand that they have been at home for a long time, and the tolerance level is running out. There are parents who resist using Teams and prevent the student from learning and participating with technology, despite the incentives that the ED has provided.

4. I emphasize exercise and practice.

94% -Assessment all the time

- In all subjects, in this case, mathematics, the student learns by doing, through consistent and assisted practice. It is the correct way to work math. You are given the space to learn, even with the demonstration of your peers and the teacher, of course. Action that must be worked with all arithmetic skills

- I focus on giving them the space to practice making sure they understood. It is seen in the students, as they participate in mastering the skill.

- The mastery of the skill is seen in the students who participate in class

5. I interact with my students and encourage empathetic communication. Feedback is crucial to motivate students and celebrate gain and correct and reteach the student at all times.

93%-Being empathetic with the student is always necessary. To get to the essence of the learning disability, doubts, and insecurity, it is necessary to show empathy. A teacher who becomes empathetic during teaching will always get the best result. In my case, I always establish empathy and usually always get the desired result or gain.

- During class I ask questions and always ask the student if he has doubts or questions to clarify.

- Yes, Teams provides to provide continuous feedback and have a better profile of the student's performance.

6. I give small tests to monitor progress. I work with the cumulative review as part of the exercise and practice.

75%-Assignments called assessments are sent to assess student progress.

-Short, advisories, and unannounced tests are also offered to track progress and lag. In this way, areas of emphasis in skill, including subject matter, are identified.

- Students in the program are measured through IEP goals and grade level skills.

- I offer short evaluations that help the student identify their level of mastery.

- Weekly I give short tests and soon test with all the concepts.

7. I work with motivators (reinforcers) to help students regulate their attention and behavior

84%-I always comply and work with positive reinforcement. For example, they can be motivated through positive comments after completing a task, a competition (they love that), small gifts, sweets or pizzas.

-They are offered stickers, time to color, among many other things that can be worked on to motivate them and praise their work.

- I motivate my students all the time.

- Fundamental part Songs, Awards and self-esteem.

- I show smiley faces when they do it correctly.

8. I analyze the data and results of the math diagnostic test, META PR, or META Alternate State Standardized Tests, Math grades of all students from previous and current grades to provide the necessary support.

62%- Last year's goal tests were not given, and they have not taken any others because they were in third grade. We took into consideration the grades they get on exams.

- I need to organize myself more in this regard.

- I always comply. The area or subject of emphasis is considered, the results of the Goal Tests are discussed in a faculty meeting, the pre-test and post-test are offered to consult gains during that school year.

- They are analyzed to identify the areas that need to be strengthened or improved.

9. I identify students who are behind in math.

93% -I always communicate with the regular room teacher to see areas and how to modify assignments.

- Are identified through diagnostic tests and assessment results to provide individualized help and increased participation.

- After identifying their difficulties, I work on reinforcement tasks.

- After identifying their difficulties, I work on reinforcement tasks.

10. I work on the instructional design in distance education, considering differentiated instruction to meet the learning challenge of students

60% -I comply. Peer games, support with peers and parents are played during class and afterwards as well. -Individualized assistance is offered to you.

-Work is done in teams and individually. The areas of greatest need are supported and reinforced.

- Work is done so that the student can receive an instruction according to his need.

- I depend on the parents to contact the student.

- After group class, individual work with the student who deserves it.

- It is a bit difficult because the parents are helping him with the assignments, and I don't know what the student's domain really is.

11. I integrate technology into the teaching process, considering the principles of RTI.

60%-Yes technology, but not small groups.

- Work within the student's academic priorities.

- Videos of short films, instructions, or songs are integrated to motivate and make the class enjoyable.

- I am absorbing everything I have learned and putting it into practice to achieve a better use in students.

- I'm learning to use a lot of the tools right now.

- I have computer areas in my classroom, and also now due to the pandemic, everything is done using the computer and various platforms.

- There are two students who are served by WhatsApp, it is in the process of incorporating them into the individual help channel.

- I have several options and different levels of difficulty

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The acquisition of knowledge at each professional development session will be evaluated with pre and post-tests, as in previous reporting periods. After each session the teachers will receive coaching and mentoring. For each service provided, the coach will complete a document that contains the labor report, needs identified, activities performed, outline of results, findings and recommendations. Also, the teachers will evaluate the performance of the services received by the coaches.

Considering the teacher's workload, PRDE is working on offering more coaching services instead of workshops. Coaching services are provided in a more individualized approach, so the teachers feel that their needs are being addressed in a specific way. At the same time, the coaches can work directly with the needs of teachers.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

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 (Principals), 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 stakeholder group. In meetings with the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial, the APR Indicators have been discussed, including the targets, as well as the development and implementation of the SSIP, 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 secondary transition guide that the SAEE is developing was done with active members of the stakeholder group from the University of PR.

All APR items are discussed with stakeholders. They provide 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 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 2020 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2020 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 2020 data, FFY 2020-2025 targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the SSIP.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The stakeholders were engaged with monthly meetings. In these meetings they were given the opportunity to review all APR indicators, including the SSIP. We have monthly meetings and considering Covid-19 pandemic monthly virtual meetings through the TEAMS platform were held. The stakeholders' concern is on the scaling up in order to allow a larger sample of schools participating and benefiting from the SSIP. This is why the SSIP scaled up to 24 elementary schools within the Humacao Region.

The activities to be implemented were discussed and co-planned to assure that they are aligned with our theory of action. Also, the discussion of the work plan for the implementation of the SSIP for the FFY 2020 was developed.

In monthly meetings with the Stakeholder Group, it was decided to have an external provider who would have the responsibility, as in previous periods, of providing the technical assistance and coaching services for regular and special education teachers in the participating schools. The number of parents participating in this group increased during this period. Through discussions with the Stakeholder Group, PRDE SAEE decided to scale up the sample increasing the number of participating schools from 3 to 24 during 2020-2021 school year.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The biggest concern presented by the stakeholder group is the possible learning loss, or academic lag, due to schools being closed for in-person learning and students instead receiving virtual education for such a long period of time due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This lag could also have an impact on the result in the statewide assessment results, and thus on the SSIP results.

PRDE prepared a plan to address the academic lag which was worked with the repetition of classes to be able to pass grade and increase the average. This plan was implemented during the summer of the 2020-2021 school year and consisted of 75-minute classes. The maximum enrollment in each classroom was 15 students.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

PRDE is working on offering more coaching services instead of workshops. Coaching services are provided in a more individualized approach, so the teachers feel that their needs are being addressed in a specific way. At the same time, the coaches can work directly with the needs of teachers.

PRDE plans to provide a direct follow up to all the activities proposed for the 2020-2021 school year through the SSIP Coordinator. As part of this follow up, this coordinator will participate in the workshops and visit the schools to observe the coaching and mentoring services as part of the monitoring process to assure the fidelity of the implementation.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The activities will be implemented as part of the SSIP work plan throughout the school year. Is expected to collect the information after implementing each of the activities. This will allow PRDE to carry out a data analysis to integrate changes if they are deemed necessary. For the school year 2021-2022 it is planned to administer the statewide assessment. The data of this test will be available at the end of the 2nd school semester.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Considering the Stakeholder Group input, PRDE identified that the funds to contract a private company to provide technical assistance as a possible barrier. Once the funds are identified for 2019-2020, the contracting process was delayed for the events mentioned previously in this report. This caused the start of the TA initiative to be delayed for the 2019-2020 period. This activity will continue (resumed) for the school year 2020-2021. Its implementation for the next reporting period has begun already.

Another barrier will be the delay in administering the META-PR assessment test.

Since virtual mode is one atypical to our school reality, we anticipate that the results in students' tests will be as expected.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

As reported on Indicator 3, due to the significant impact the COVID-19 pandemic had in Puerto Rico, the PRDE requested, and was subsequently granted, a waiver of the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to administer statewide assessments to all public elementary and secondary school students in the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the 2020-2021 school year. On August 27, 2021, ED OESE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs Ian Rosenblum issued a letter approving PRDE's waiver request. A copy of that August 27, 2021 waiver letter is available on-line at: <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/08/PRDE-Assessment-Waiver-Response.pdf>. As stated therein, the letter approves PRDE's request and waives "the requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for the 2020-2021 school year to administer statewide general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science" as well as "sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii), (vii), and (xi) of the ESEA regarding the reporting of student results on the general and alternate assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (and the requirements in section 1111(h)(2)(C) for the local report cards)."

As such, and in accordance with OSEP guidance regarding the handling of the waiver of statewide administration of assessments for the 2019-2020 school year, no data or information is available or required for this indicator in Puerto Rico's FFY 2020 APR. Following administration of the statewide assessments for the 2021-2022 school year, PRDE will analyze data in consultation with stakeholders in order to set targets through FFY 2025 and establish new baseline data, as appropriate, for this indicator. This analysis will include data for all participating SSIP schools.

A copy of PRDE's Theory of Action is available in the following link: https://compascgcom-my.sharepoint.com/:b/g/personal/yayala_compascg_com/ETpLBby90XtDr9RYPreVHT8B24zHQm23hevb1KBND070LQ?e=tSff9m

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

PRDE did not provide targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator.

PRDE did not provide any FFY 2020 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 those FFY 2020 data available to report for this indicator. PRDE provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the PRDE has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection for this indicator.

PRDE must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

17 - 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 Carrión

Title:

Compliance Officer

Email:

carriondn@de.pr.gov

Phone:

+17873806997

Submitted on:

04/28/22 4:06:07 PM