SSIP Introduction

Florida has prioritized the need for all students to graduate from high school college and career ready in order to compete in today's global and high tech workforce. The focus on high school graduation leading to post-school success is a fundamental principle in both IDEA and ESEA. Florida's commitment to this goal is reflected in our ESEA Flexibility Waiver, as well as our Race to the Top grant participation. For several years, there has been broad, multiple, internal and external stakeholder representation in response to these federal initiatives; including the development of state statutes, rules and policies to support the goal of all students graduating from high school college and career ready.

Research points to the importance of a standard high school diploma for students with disabilities. While progress has been made in this area there is still a gap. This gap limits opportunities for full participation in meaningful post-school options for students with disabilities. It is important that every student who is preparing to graduate from high school be college and career ready. The National Center on Educational Outcomes in collaboration with Achieve released a report titled *Graduation Requirements for Students with Disabilities: Ensuring Meaningful Diplomas for All Students.* This report emphasizes the need for students with disabilities to be held to high standards for earning a state's standard diploma, an objective that requires courses that will better prepare them to enter the postsecondary and employment world. The report states that in 2018, 63% of all U.S. jobs will require some postsecondary education and that 90% of new jobs in growing industries will require some postsecondary education as well (NCEO, 2013).

Florida has used the problem solving process for all areas of continuous improvement. Evidence of this is found in student specific problem solving related to a student's response to intervention, school and district based problem solving to develop a multi-tiered system of support, and state level problem solving to inform results driven accountability. The process is included in each of Florida schools' continuous improvement plans and district improvement plans. The problem solving process was also used for the development of all components of the State Performance Plan and State Systemic Improvement Plan; including data analysis, infrastructure analysis, identification of the SIMR, development of the theory of action and improvement strategies.

The steps are as follows:

1. Problem identification (Is there a problem and what is it?)

2. Problem Analysis (Why is the problem occurring? What is the root cause?)

3. Intervention Design (What can be done about the problem?)

4. Evaluation (Did the intervention or action solve the problem?)

Component #1 Data Analysis

1(a) Broad Data Analysis and Results:

The first step of the problem solving process is to identify the problem, the goal in relation to an expected performance and any discrepancy between desired outcomes and current reality.

The following section describes the outcomes of the broad data analysis:

Staff, in conjunction with internal and external stakeholders, identified a variety of data sets that would be analyzed; including state and district data by disability category, gender, racial and ethnic category, and educational environment/placement. The following section provides a description and the results of the in-depth analysis:

Initially, the analysis included a broad review of state data to determine areas of low and high performance for students with disabilities. There was a need to examine Florida's graduation data in both a broad sense, as well as a more focused review; including disaggregation across multiple variables. The broad analysis led to the identification of a primary area of concern that became the State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR). The data revealed that overall the graduation rate for SWD has increased in Florida, at or above the same rate that the overall graduation rate has increased; thus the gap for SWD has decreased.

Florida's federal uniform graduation rate increased 15 percentage points and the gap between students with disabilities and all students was narrowed by 4.9 percentage points from 2008-09 to 2012-13. This represents a graduation rate of 37.3% for students with disabilities and 65.5% for all students in 2008-09 and 52.3% for students with disabilities and 75.6% for all students in 2012-13.

Based on the completion of the broad data analysis, the SEA identified a primary concern of increasing graduation rate for students with disabilities and closing the graduation gap for students with disabilities as compared to their non-disabled peers.

1(b) In-depth (Focused) Multi-Variable Data Analysis and Root Cause Analysis:

The second step of the problem solving process is analysis to determine the root cause contributing to the discrepancy between desired outcomes and current reality.

The state conducted an in-depth data analysis to further define the area of low performance, determine the root cause of poor performance, and confirm the suitability of the performance/results area as a SIMR for the SSIP. This analysis was conducted to further determine if there were certain variables, as referenced previously, associated with graduation rates. This in-depth analysis also included a root cause analysis to identify the contributing factors and root causes leading to low graduation rates.

Multi-Variable Data Analysis

The in-depth analysis of results data included a disaggregation of data by multiple variables including district, disability category, gender, racial and ethnic category, and educational environment/placement. The following section provides a description and the results of the in-depth analysis:

The data was reviewed with a more focused lens to include a review by district over time as well as by student race and ethnicity. The number of districts with a graduation rate greater than 50% increased from 19 districts in 2005-06 to 52 districts in 2012-13. In 2012-13, 5 districts had a graduation rate < 30% while 4 districts had a graduation rate > 90%. There is a concern that while the overall graduation rate is increasing the variability suggests that improvements must be made to ensure success is equitable for all students with disabilities in Florida. District variability was not closely related to the size of the district or geographic location of the district; however the statewide data shows graduation rates have improved as regular class placement has increased.

When reviewing statewide graduation by race/ethnicity the data continue to reveal a graduation gap between white students and black, Hispanic and American Indian students; although the gap has closed slightly for each group from the 2010-11 graduating cohort. This graduation gap by race/ethnicity is proportionally represented when considering graduation rates of students without disabilities by race and ethnicity. Additionally, the graduation gap that exists between students with disabilities and non-disabled peers is consistent across disability categories, with the exclusion of students with disabilities who may have significant cognitive disabilities and are participating in a special diploma. Special

diplomas are not included in the Federal Uniform Rate and are not recognized as a standard high school diploma.

Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) data consistently demonstrate that students with disabilities who earn a standard diploma are nearly as likely to be employed, either part or full time, as all students with a standard diploma. Their participation in continued education tends to be about 18 percentage points lower than all students and students with disabilities who do continue their education are more likely to attend state colleges or district postsecondary programs and less likely to attend state universities than all students.

Students earning special diplomas lag behind students with a standard diploma in part time employment by about 30 percentage points, although they are as likely to be employed full time. With regard to continuing education, they lag behind students with disabilities who earned a standard diploma by about 40 percentage points and behind all students who earned a standard diploma by about 60 percentage points.

Root Cause Analysis

Based on the completion of the in-depth multi-variable data analysis, the SEA identified the following root causes contributing to low performance.

1. The lack of increased opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in general education courses in the regular class environment, with support from highly effective teachers and leaders.
2. Loss of time in the general education classes due to disciplinary consequences such as in-school suspension, out of school suspension and expulsion, secured seclusion and restraint.
3. Disproportionate representation of students by race or ethnicity.
4. The inability for students with significant cognitive disabilities to earn a standard high school diploma, rather than a special diploma.

1(c) Data Quality:

Data quality was reviewed during the completion of the data analysis. Based on the review, it was determined that data quality concerns do not exist.

Florida's automated student database was implemented in 1987 and has been fully operational since January 1991. In this integrated pupil-based information system, data is submitted electronically through surveys with data elements organized in formats (Student Demographic, Exceptional Student, Student End-of-Year Status, student Discipline/Referral Action, etc.) The database operates the funding mechanism, OCR reporting, OSEP reporting, NCES reporting and also serves other areas. The system collects information six times a year in July, October, December, February, June, and August. Following the due date for each survey districts have a window to update submissions.

Florida has one of the most comprehensive student databases in the country. The consistent use of unique student identifiers in the student database allows Florida to aggregate/disaggregate data from the individual student, school, district, and state level. Data can be linked across formats and years. Reliability is achieved through consistent directions provided through technical assistance and database manuals. Edits are built into the automated student database; State validation and exceptions reports are produced and districts are given time to correct errors. A data quality review process is available for districts needing assistance.

The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services works closely with Education Information and Accountability Services, Bureau of PK-20 Education Reporting and Accessibility, and the PK-20 Education Data warehouse to ensure accurate reporting. Districts are aware of consequences for data that are not timely and/or accurate. In addition to standard reporting procedures, the bureau conducts data verification activities with districts and uses results of these activities in making district determinations.

1(d) Compliance Data and Barriers to Improvement:

During the completion of the data analysis, the state considered compliance data collected through the SPP/APR (Section 616 data) and through state monitoring activities and determined whether those data present potential barriers to improving the graduation rate for students with disabilities. The analysis of compliance data yielded the following result:

As described in the root cause analysis, compliance data related to LRE, disproportionate discipline and identification were identified as barriers to increased graduation rates for students with disabilities. A review of compliance data related to quality development of transition IEPS (Indicator 13) revealed high levels of compliance; however high levels of compliance for this indicator did not necessarily equate to increased outcomes. Based on this analysis, it was determined the compliance data does have an impact on the goal to increase the number of students with disabilities graduating with a standard diploma ready for college and career.

1(e) Additional Data Needed:

Based on the data analysis, it was determined that additional data were not needed at this time. The state staff, in conjunction with internal and external stakeholders, decided that adequate data were available to identify the SIMR, establish FFY baseline data, and set targets for FFY 2014 through FFY 2018. In addition, data were available to determine specific regions, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups to receive additional supports through the SSIP.

1(f) Stakeholder Input:

Stakeholders, internal and external, were included in all components of the data analysis, beginning with the planning for Florida's Race to the Top initiative, ESEA Flex Waiver and development of the State Board of Education's Strategic Plan. Stakeholders included the State Advisory Committee for Exceptional Student Education and other stakeholder groups assembled specifically to support the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) staff in developing and implementing the goal of ensuring all students with disabilities graduate college and career ready. The FLDOE collaborated with stakeholder groups consisting of parents, students, educators and administrators from representative districts, state agencies, advocacy groups, federally funded parent centers, and members of the State Advisory Committee. The SSIP stakeholder groups participated in the process through data analysis identifies areas of concern regarding the performance of SWD and assisted in identifying the root causes or barriers contributing to low performance. They also provided information about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the state's infrastructure.
Input was gathered through a variety of groups and venues including, but not limited to:
- Facilitated the State Advisory Committee for Exceptional Student Education
- Engaged parent, educator and other stakeholders to provide feedback to the State Board of Education on Strategic Plan and ESEA Flexibility Waiver
- Conducted round table meetings with district directors of special education and student services.
- Facilitated on-site district focus groups including, students, teachers and administrators.

- Coordinated the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee, which includes parents, district personnel, partner agencies and others.
- Coordinated the Graduation Pathways Taskforce, which included parents, district personnel and others.

Component #2 Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

2(a) Infrastructure Analysis Process:

As described in Component #1 Data Analysis, the state used the problem solving process for analyzing the capacity of the current state infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve college and career ready graduation rates for students with disabilities and close the graduation gap for students with disabilities as compared to their non-disabled peers.

2(b) Description of State Systems:

The state identified the need to review the following components of the state's system infrastructure in relation to the SIMR: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring.
This section will provide a description of each of these systems.

Governance

The Florida Education Governance Reorganization Act of 2000 codified the reorganization of the state's educational system. This action authorizes the governor to appoint a seven-member state board of education, the state board in turn appoints the chief state school officer, titled the commissioner of education. The Florida legislature has a house K-20 committee and a senate education committee.

The Florida state board of education has 7-voting members who are appointed by the governor for 4 year staggered terms and may be reappointed for up to 2 consecutive terms. The Commissioner serves in an advisory capacity to the state board. Florida does not have a Secretary of Education as part of the Governor's Cabinet. The state's public primary and secondary schools are administered by the FLDOE. The FLDOE also has authority over the Florida College System. The State University System is under the authority of the Florida Board of Governors.

There are no regional boards or superintendents in Florida. As mandated by the Florida Constitution, Article IX, section 4, Florida has 67 school districts, one for each county. All are separate from municipal government. School districts tax property within their jurisdictions to support their budgets. School districts are organized within county boundaries. Under Florida statute, each county comprises a school district. Additionally, there are four laboratory schools (operated by Florida A & M University, Florida Atlantic University, Florida State University, and the University of Florida), the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind, and the Florida Virtual School, provided for under statute, and the Okeechobee Youth Development Center, which is administered through the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice by a private contractor. In total, there are 74 districts in the state: one for each of the 67 counties, one each for the four research schools, one for the school for the deaf and blind, one for the virtual school, and one for the youth development center. There are 4,200 public schools in Florida. Florida is now the nation's third most populous state in the nation, according to the latest Census.

Each school district has an elected Board of education that sets policy, budget, goals and approves expenditures. Management is the responsibility of a Superintendent of schools. County superintendents are elected, unless local electors allow the school boards to appoint a superintendent. The majority of superintendents are elected. Additionally, state policy allows collective bargaining between school districts and their employees.

Mission of the State Board of Education

The mission of Florida's K-20 education system is to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless efficient system, by allowing them the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents and communities.

Vision
Florida will have an efficient world-class education system that engages and prepares all students to be globally competitive for college and careers.

Goals
• Higher Student Achievement
• Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access
• Skilled Workforce and Economic Development
• Quality Efficient Services

Fiscal

As described in the most recent Funding for Florida School Districts Report FLDOE, 2014), the Florida legislature is constitutionally responsible for ensuring that adequate funding for education is provided and that it is properly allocated even though funding derives from a combination of local, state and federal dollars.

The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) was enacted in 1973 by the Florida Legislature as its method for funding public education in a manner that would "guarantee to each student in the Florida public education system the availability of programs and services appropriate to his or her educational needs."
Funding for the FEFP combines state funds - primarily generated from sales tax revenue - and local funds - generated from property tax revenue. It is important to note that the FEFP is only the centerpiece of the total funding for education. Funding for a variety of programs and services - such as school construction, workforce development and preschool programs - is provided in addition to the funds allocated through the FEFP.

To provide equal educational opportunities for all children, each component of the FEFP equation attempts to adjust education funding to meet the particular needs and conditions of each of Florida's 67 counties. The FEFP uses the following information to determine the amount of funding to be allocated: the local property tax base, costs of education programs, costs of living, and scarcity of student population. During each legislative session, every component of the equation is subject to debate and adjustment. Existing equation components may be amended, new components may be added and components may be deleted in response to the state's political and economic climate and in the ongoing effort to meet the changing needs of Florida's diverse population.

The Commissioner is responsible for recommending ways of cooperating with the federal government on any phase of the education program in which cooperation is desirable. The Commissioner recommends policies for administering funds appropriated from federal sources to the state for any

education purpose and provides for the execution of plans and policies.

School districts receive funds from the federal government directly and through the state as an administering agency. School districts may receive federal funds from various agencies such as the Department of Labor, Veterans Administration, Department of Interior, Department of Education, Department of Defense and Department of Agriculture.

Federal funding also supports No Child Left Behind programs, which establish accountability measures for public schools to ensure that students in all schools are reaching proficiency in reading and math; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act programs, which support education services for students with physical and mental challenges; Workforce Investment Act entitlement programs (for detail regarding Workforce Development Education programs, see page 26); and Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act programs, which improve the quality of career and technical education in Florida.

Federal funds are typically used to supplement state and local funds authorized by the Florida Legislature to support various education programs.

Student Performance-Based Funding
Florida law (Section 1011.62(1)(l)(m-n), Florida Statutes) provides incentive funds for schools and teachers based on the number of students who take and score at or above identified scores on AP, IB, and AICE exams. Specifically, an additional value of 0.16 full-time equivalent (FTE) is reported by LEAs for:

- Each student enrolled in an AP class who earns a score of three or higher on an AP exam, provided they have been taught in an AP class in the prior year.
- Each student enrolled in an IB course who receives a score of four or higher on the subject exam.
- An AICE student if he or she receives a score of "E" on a full-credit subject exam or an additional 0.08 FTE if he or she is enrolled in a half-credit class and earns a score of "E" or higher on the subject exam.
- Each student who receives an IB or AICE diploma.

From the funding generated by the bonus FTE of these programs, Florida law (Sections 1011.62(1)(l), (m-n), Florida Statutes), requires LEAs to distribute bonuses to certain classroom teachers as follows:

- International Baccalaureate – A bonus of $50 is earned by an IB teacher for each student in each IB course who receives a score of four or higher on the IB exam. An additional bonus of $500 is earned by the IB teacher in a school designated with a performance grade category "D" or "F" who has at least one student scoring four or higher on the IB subject exam. Bonuses awarded to a teacher may not exceed $2,000 per school year.
- Advanced International Certificate of Education – A teacher earns a $50 bonus for each student in the full-credit AICE course who receives a score of "E" or higher on the subject exam and a $25 bonus for each student in each half-credit AICE course who receives a score of "E" or higher on the subject exam. Additional bonuses of $500 and $250 for full-credit and half-credit courses, respectively, shall be awarded to AICE teachers in a school designated with a performance grade category "D" or "F" who have at least one student passing the subject exam in that class. The maximum additional bonus in a given school year is $500 for those teachers who teach half-credit courses and $2,000 for those teachers who teach full-credit courses.
- Advanced Placement – A $50 bonus is earned by an AP teacher for each student in each AP course who receives a score of three or higher on the AP examination. An additional bonus of

$500 is earned by the AP teacher in a school designated with a performance grade category "D" or "F" who has at least one student scoring three or higher on an AP exam. Bonuses awarded to a teacher may not exceed $2,000 per school year.

Florida law (Section 1011.62(1)(o), Florida Statutes) also provides incentives for students who complete an industry-certified career or professional academy program and who is issued the highest level of Industry Certification and a high school diploma. For these students, an additional value of 0.1, 0.2, or 0.3 FTE student membership is added.

It is estimated that a total of $86,171,014 was allocated to LEAs in 2011-12 for the above incentives.

Quality Standards

As described in the most recent ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request, Florida has proven itself a national leader in developing and adopting rigorous standards via the internationally-benchmarked Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, the standards adopted in 2010, and the Florida Standards. In the 2010 *Education Week* Quality Counts report, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards received an "A" rating with a perfect score of 100%. In the Fordham Institute report *The State of State Standards – and the Common Core – in 2010*, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards were rated highly (A for mathematics; B for English/Language Arts).

The first formal analysis of the alignment of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and the Common Core State Standards began in April of 2008 when former Florida Governor Charlie Crist announced Florida's participation in Achieve's American Diploma Project Network. The FLDOE worked with Achieve to analyze Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to identify any gaps in content that all students should know and be able to do to meet the college-and career-ready definition. After analyzing Florida's standards, Achieve's College Ready Standards, and the proposed Common Core State Standards it was determined that the content of Florida's standards was not a barrier to college and career readiness and that that transition to the standards adopted in 2010 would be less challenging given their similarities.

The 2010 Fordham Institute report, referenced above, also included a comparison of Florida's English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to the Common Core State Standards. The result was a rating of "too close to call," finding both sets of standards clear and rigorous. This review provided greater support for the transition to the standards adopted in 2010.

Florida's education leaders have been strong advocates in national and state forums historically for the benefits of multi-state work on high-quality, clear, and rigorous standards. The state's full commitment was also demonstrated by the active participation of FLDOE staff on Common Core State Standards work groups. Florida was one of three states invited by Council of Chief State School Officers to provide guidance and comments to the writers during national standards development. Additionally, Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards were cited as a resource for the development of the Common Core State Standards.

Adoption of the Standards in 2010

Florida's activities to garner support for the adoption of the Common Core State Standards began prior to their completion. Florida's former Commissioner of Education Eric Smith was one of the key state leaders in the decision to develop internationally-competitive content standards for states and Florida staff actively participated in the development of the Common Core State Standards. During this process,

curriculum leaders throughout the state were invited to review drafts of the Common Core State Standards and provide the FLDOE input that was then shared with the Common Core State Standards writing teams. FLDOE also partnered with the Florida Parent and Teacher Association (PTA) as one of only four states selected by the National PTA to organize parent support for more uniform academic expectations and adoption of the Common Core State Standards. The President of Florida's PTA spoke in favor of Florida's adoption of the Common Core State Standards at the June 14, 2010, State Board of Education meeting. Other key stakeholder groups that spoke in support of adoption of the Common Core State Standards included the Florida Chamber of Commerce and STEM*Florida*. The standards were adopted on July 27, 2010.

The above activities were in addition to those required in Florida law, Section 1003.41(3)(a), Florida Statutes, which requires the Commissioner to submit proposed standards:

- For review and comment by Florida educators, school administrators, representatives of Florida College System institutions and state universities who have expertise in the content knowledge and skills necessary to prepare a student for postsecondary education, and leaders in business and industry.
- For written evaluation by renowned experts on K-12 curricular standards and content after considering any comments and making any revisions to the proposed standards.
- To the Governor, President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives at least 21 days before the State Board of Education considers adoption, along with the curricular and content evaluations.

Once the standards were adopted in 2010, the next step was to determine the timeline for implementation into classrooms. Florida had recently transitioned to assessments aligned to the state's "A"- and "B"-rated Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in mathematics and ELA, which was preceded by the adoption of instructional materials that included lessons to teach these standards. The recent implementation of these rigorous standards prepared all educators and students for a successful transition to the standards adopted in 2010. Florida used the investments made in the preparation of teachers to teach the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, including instruction of rigorous content followed by rigorous assessments, to support the transition.

Adoption and Timelines for Implementation of the Florida Standards

In 2013 groups of constituents voiced concerns about the Common Core Standards and lack of Florida stakeholder input. To address these concerns, under the leadership of Governor Rick Scott, the Commissioner conducted public hearings and provided a web-based public review of the standards providing an opportunity to make changes that would result in a stronger set of standards. All comments were compiled and a group of education content experts, including postsecondary experts, reviewed them and proposed ninety-nine changes which included the addition of cursive writing to the elementary English language arts standards and calculus to the mathematics standards. These new strengthened standards were adopted by Florida's State Board of Education February 2014.

Florida Standards assessments will begin with third grade students in the 2014-2015 school year. Therefore, students entering kindergarten in 2011-2012 are the first cohort to be assessed only on these new standards and never assessed on the mathematics and ELA Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. It is for this reason that Florida implemented a transition schedule that began with kindergarten instruction, based on the standards adopted in 2010 in school year 2011-2012, added first grade in the 2012-2013 school year, and added grades 2-12 in the 2013-2014 school year. In 2013-14 grades 3-12 have a blended approach with the primary focus on the standards adopted in 2010 plus any

content still assessed on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (see chart below). This transition plan provided our youngest students with three years of instruction on the standards adopted in 2010 and all students with a transition year of instruction prior to the full implementation of the Florida Standards and assessments.

Florida is one of the only large states with a statewide K-12 instructional materials adoption process that ensures the provision of high-quality instructional materials aligned to the Florida Standards to support teaching and learning for all students. Florida's published specifications require that instructional materials submitted must:

- Be aligned with the Florida Standards.
- Reflect the demands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking that are specific to the content area.
- Include vocabulary development, cognitive reasoning, and reading acquisition skills specific to literacy in the content area.
- Include strategies within teacher and student resources that support the unique literacy demands of the content area.
- Include assessment tools for assessing student learning and information for instructional decision making.
- Include a professional development plan for use with the materials.
- Include strategies, materials, and activities that consider and address the needs of students with disabilities (universal design for curriculum access).
- Include teacher and student resources for English language learners that support both the content and academic vocabulary of the content area.

The instructional materials adoption process includes a review of all submitted materials by content experts followed by a review by all LEAs for usability and appropriateness. Florida is the first in the nation to utilize a completely digital review process that guarantees public access to reviewers' comments for all adopted materials.

Professional Development and Technical Assistance

As described in the most recent ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request , Section 1012.98, Florida Statutes, requires FLDOE, public postsecondary institutions, LEAs, schools, state education foundations, consortia, and professional organizations to work collaboratively to establish a coordinated system of professional development. The express purpose of this statewide system is to increase student achievement, enhance classroom instructional strategies that promote rigor and relevance throughout the curriculum, and prepare students for college and careers. This system of professional development is required to be aligned to the state-adopted standards and support the framework for standards adopted by the National Staff Development Council. Florida law also specifies the following responsibilities for FLDOE, LEAs, and postsecondary institutions:
- FLDOE
  - Disseminate to the school community research-based professional development methods and programs that have demonstrated success in meeting identified student needs.
  - Use data on student achievement to identify student needs.
  - Methods of dissemination must include a web-based statewide performance support system, including a database of exemplary professional development activities, a listing of available professional development resources, training programs, and available assistance.
- LEA

- o Develop a professional development system in consultation with teachers, teacher-educators of Florida College System institutions and state universities, business and community representatives, local education foundations, consortia, and professional organizations. The professional development system must:
  - Be approved by FLDOE.
  - Be based on analyses of student achievement data and instructional strategies and methods that support rigorous, relevant, and challenging curricula for all students.
  - Provide inservice activities coupled with follow-up support appropriate to accomplish LEA- and school-level improvement goals and standards.
  - Include a master plan for inservice activities, pursuant to rules of the State Board of Education, for all LEA employees from all fund sources. The master plan must be updated annually by September 1, based on input from teachers and LEA and school instructional leaders, and must use the latest available student achievement data and research to enhance rigor and relevance in the classroom. Each LEA inservice plan must be aligned to and support the school-based inservice plans and school improvement plans. LEA plans must be approved by the LEA school board annually. LEA school boards must submit verification of their approval to the Commissioner of Education no later than October 1, annually.
  - Require each school principal to establish and maintain an individual professional development plan for each instructional employee assigned to the school.
  - Include inservice activities for school administrative personnel that address updated skills necessary for instructional leadership and effective school management.
  - Provide for systematic consultation with regional and state personnel designated to provide technical assistance and evaluation of local professional development programs.
  - Provide for delivery of professional development by distance learning and other technology-based delivery systems to reach more educators at lower costs.
  - Provide for the continuous evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of professional development programs in order to eliminate ineffective programs and strategies and to expand effective ones.

To carry out the FLDOE's responsibilities, as stated above, and to support the LEAs' implementation of these professional development requirements, Florida's Race to the Top projects include activities and products related to the adoption and implementation of the Florida Standards. All of the projects below include a professional development component for teachers and school administrators.

- Development of mathematics and ELA (including English language acquisition) formative assessments to improve day-to-day individualized standards instruction.
- Development of school-level professional development Lesson Study toolkits for mathematics formative assessments, ELA formative assessments, and instructional use of student data.
- Development of mathematics and ELA interim assessments for classroom, school, and LEA use to periodically monitor individual student, classroom-level, and school-level student success in mastering the Florida Standards.
- Development and launching of the Teacher Standards Instructional Tool where teachers can access the standards, link to related resources, and access model lessons as well as the developed formative assessments, toolkits, and interim assessments.

- Development of, piloting, and implementing school-level training materials and "Help" tutorials for teachers on accessing the resources and assessments available on the Teacher Standards Instructional Tool by a postsecondary institution.

The 65 Race to the Top participating LEAs signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that includes:

- Ensuring that professional development programs in all schools focus on the new state adopted standards, including assisting students with learning challenges to meet those standards (such as through accommodations and assistive technology). Such professional development will employ formative assessment and the principles of Lesson Study.
- Evaluating the fidelity of Lesson Study and formative assessment implementation that is tied to interim and summative student assessments.

Additionally, the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices are set forth in rule as Florida's core standards for effective educators (Rule 6A-5.065, Florida Administrative Code, Attachment 10c). Florida universities were represented on the state committee development teams who drafted these practices and a work group of university professors are now working with the FLDOE to develop tools to help faculty in teacher preparation programs to align their curriculum with these practices and to develop assessment instruments to assess student teachers in their demonstration of them. FLDOE has provided training to teacher educators on the new Accomplished Practices and is providing ongoing training specifically to assist preparation programs with high-quality integration of the Accomplished Practices with the state's teacher competencies in reading and in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL).

District professional development activities in Florida are guided by Florida's Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol. This evaluation model assesses the local planning, learning, implementation, and evaluation of professional development activities according to standards modeled after the Learning Forward (formerly National Staff Development Council) standards as well as Florida statutory requirements. The Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol includes standards that serve to identify and recognize best practices as well as to identify local professional development systems in need of improvement. Information and resources are provided in support of district work on the development and continuing improvement of professional development systems to support student learning and proficiency development for instructional personnel, school administrators, and support staff can be found at http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/professional-dev.

Accountability, Monitoring and Technical Assistance

Florida's accountability and monitoring system, as describe in the most recent ESEA Flexibility Request, is designed to focus schools, LEAs, communities, and the state on raising the achievement of all students. This includes the annual reporting of graduation and participation rates by subgroups. This transparency ensures that the performance of each student subgroup is reviewed and reported. In addition, as demonstrated in the ESEA Flexibility Request, Florida's school grades system has led to significant increase in the performance of subgroups over time.

This uniform system of accountability includes:

- Recognition of and rewards for its highest-performing and improving schools.

- Increasing levels of LEA and state support to close the achievement gap for all subgroups of students, including English language learners and students with disabilities.

Florida's accountability system is characterized by ongoing increases in standards which have led to continuing increases in student performance across all subgroups. Florida's assessment, accountability, and teacher evaluation systems foster progress and are designed to accelerate academic improvement. Together these systems focus on the achievement gap, increase accountability for high-need students, set high academic standards, recognize and reward growth in student learning, and recognize the most effective teachers. Florida has implemented forward-looking reforms designed to raise student achievement. Historically, when Florida has raised its accountability standards Florida students have responded by increasing their performance to meet the challenge.

Florida's ESEA Flexibility Request moves the state forward in strengthening and enhancing its accountability system. Florida's Legislature has demonstrated strong support for high standards and school accountability over time. Consistent with state legislation, Florida will continue to use school grades as the basis for identifying Priority and Focus schools. The enhanced School Grades system focuses all accountability resources and attention on one system to move all students forward to attain college- and career-ready standards. In addition, the School Grades system identifies underperforming schools and districts in need of differentiated levels of support through Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system. This strategy helps communities embrace accountability for their schools in a way that is designed to provide support and raise the achievement of all students to meet college and career expectations.

Key Features of Florida's School Grades System

- Components based on assessments aligned with state curriculum standards.
- Progressively increasing rigor in the assessments themselves (with both comprehensive subject area examinations and end-of-course assessments set to newly operational Next Generation Sunshine State Standards) and in the application of criteria for school grading.
- Legislative support: school grading requirements codified (Section 1008.34, Florida Statutes, and Rule 6A-1.09981, Florida Administrative Code).
- A balance between student performance and student learning gains (growth).
- Points-based system that allows for a tiered (literally, graded) group of ratings (rather than a conjunctive system such as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), for which any missed target results in a "No progress" or "Not adequate progress" outcome for the school).
- Criterion-based system for the assessments used in determining student achievement and progress as well as for the points scale for assigning school grades, including additional requirements for participation in testing ("percent-tested" criterion) and progress of the lowest-performing students.
- Provides an incentive for schools to focus on improving the lowest-performing 25% of students.
- Florida's School Grades system is applied to all schools including charter schools.
- Documented significant improvement in student performance following raised standards over time.

High School Accountability

Legislation passed in 2008 (Section 1008.34, Florida Statutes) required Florida to move to a high school accountability system that, in addition to the focus on academic performance and performance gains measured by student achievement on statewide assessments, provided an equal focus on:
- Student access to and performance in rigorous, accelerated coursework including Advanced

Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE), Dual Enrollment (DE), and Industry Certification (IC). Performance is measured by exam scores (AP, IB, AICE), course grades (DE), or completion of certification requirements (IC).

- Student measures of college readiness determined by identified SAT, ACT, or P.E.R.T. exam scores.
- Graduation rates for all students, providing an additional graduation rate for academically at-risk students.
- Performance on additional statewide EOC assessments (e.g., U.S. History).

In conjunction with implementation of this new high school accountability system, Florida has seen a ramping up of student participation in AP, IB, and AICE courses and program areas, as well as increased Dual Enrollment course offerings and rising enrollment in Industry Certification programs. Likewise, Florida student participation in ACT, SAT, and college placement examinations has continued to rise, especially for the state's minority populations. With broad expansion of participation in advanced curricula and college entrance exams, Florida's largest minority groups have also shown increased performance on AP examinations and notable reductions in achievement gaps. Florida's graduation rates have also continued to rise in recent years, with some of the greatest sustained increases occurring among the state's students with disabilities and minority populations.

Differentiated Accountability

Authority for applying interventions of increasing intensity in the lowest-performing, schools is codified in s. 1008.33, F.S. The specifics of the interventions are outlined in Rule 6A-1.099811, F.A.C., or the "Differentiated Accountability (DA) Rule," and its incorporated forms, which are reviewed and revised as needed for approval by the State Board of Education. The current incorporated forms are listed as follows and available at https://www.floridacims.org/downloads?category=da-forms:

- Form DA-1, Checklist for Districts with Focus or Priority Schools
- Form DA-2, Checklist for Focus and Priority Schools
- Form DIAP-1, District Improvement and Assistance Plan outline
- Form SIP-1, School Improvement Plan outline
- Form TOP-1, Turnaround Option Plan – Phase 1 outline
- Form TOP-2, Turnaround Option Plan – Phase 2 outline

In accordance with the DA Rule, FLDOE and the district have authority to direct interventions in a school that has received a grade of "F," including providing onsite monitoring and support. The district in turn is required to provide ongoing assistance and support to the school, whether it is directly or through a lead partner.

As described in the most recent ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request, Florida conducted a comprehensive review of the differentiated accountability process to ensure that the system fully aligned all required state and federal accountability components including those of IDEA. Consequently, the school and district improvement plan outlines (SIP-1 and DIAP-1, respectively) were redesigned to include the following primary elements:

- Part I: Current Status

  District and school leadership teams provide narrative responses to questions organized around the five essential supports (i.e., Supportive Environment, Family and Community Involvement,

Effective Leadership, Public and Collaborative Teaching, and Ambitious Instruction and Learning). This first portion provides a structure in which to organize the current multi-tiered system of supports and programs for purposes of informing the subsequent needs assessment and problem solving activities.

- Part II: Needs Assessment

  District and school leadership teams review their performance in terms of annual measurable objectives (AMOs), school grading formula cells, early warning systems (EWS) data, graduation rates, and Florida's value added model (VAM) in order to accurately identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement, identify root causes for each, and develop potentially impactful strategic goals and associated data targets.

  This process, which has come to be known in Florida as "Step Zero," is supported in the field by DA school improvement facilitators and by BSI staff who continue to add additional data displays and technical assistance resources to Florida's online Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS).

- Part III: 8-Step Planning and Problem Solving (8SPPS) for Implementation

  In the third section of the SIP and DIAP, school and district leaders plan for implementation of the highest-priority strategic goals developed through the "Step Zero" process in the Needs Assessment section. The explicit structures of the process encourage the problem solvers to clarify their strategic goal by describing the desired state (Step 1), identify potential resources and barriers to the goal (Step 2), organize and prioritize the barriers (Step 3), identify and prioritize possible strategies for reducing the identified barriers (Step 4), develop action plans for implementing selected strategies (Step 5), develop monitoring plans (Steps 6 and 7), and develop a program evaluation plan (Step 8).

  In combination, "Step Zero" and the 8SPPS process are intended to provide district and school leaders with an opportunity to incrementally increase the degree to which thoughtfully selected, well-implemented activities are aligned to clearly articulated, potentially powerful strategic goals, which are themselves demonstrably aligned to root causes of student under-performance.

2(c) Current Strengths, Extent of Coordination and Areas for Improvement:

Current Strengths and Coordination: State staff, in conjunction with internal and external stakeholders, identified overall strengths and coordination within and across state systems. The analysis identified the following areas as coordinated strengths of the system aligned to support LEAs and schools improve the SIMR.

- Appointed state board of education and commissioner by governor provides clear executive level communication on state priorities.
- State Board of Education Strategic Plan sets clear priorities.
- Legislative action taken to promote college and career readiness for all students- Section 1012.98, Florida Statutes.
- Recent legislation that repealed Florida's special diploma and provides rigorous pathways for all students to earn Florida's Standard diploma –Section 1003.4282(11), Florida Statutes
- ESEA Flexibility Waiver aligns Florida's Differentiated Accountability System with requirements of ESEA.

15

- Florida College and Career Ready Standards and Assessment.
- The Department of Education's Division of Standards and Instructional Support includes special education.
- There is a common commitment to priorities within the agency.
- Alignment of budgets and allocations with priorities of agency.
- LEA alignment with counties allows for reduced duplication of efforts and efficient mechanism for local control..
- Data system that provides, state, district, school and student level information for continuous improvement.

Areas for Improvement within and Across Systems: State staff, in conjunction with internal and external stakeholders, identified areas for improvement within and across systems. The analysis identified the following as areas for improvement:

- Districts need support in the implementation of the standards and courses required for a standard diploma.
- Critical shortages in ESE and related services- Teachers of SWD are less qualified teachers in content areas.
- Districts need support to help all staff understanding how their work connects to the goal of ensuring all students graduate college, career and life ready and how to address barriers that arise.
- Date system is rich; however variation exists among districts in relation to accessing systems data to drive improvement efforts.
- In some districts special education is separate from the curriculum and instructional support division.

2(d) Current State-level Improvement Plans and Initiatives:

In completing the infrastructure analysis component of the SSIP, the state staff and their internal and external stakeholders identified relevant state-level general education and special education improvement plans and initiatives to determine how the plans were aligned with the SIMR and, how the plans could be leveraged to support the SIMR, and the degree to which they could be integrated. The following improvement plans and initiatives were identified as integrated and aligned to support LEAs and schools improve the SIMR.
- Student Success Act -Section 1012.98, Florida Statutes
- Race to the Top
- ESEA Flexibility Waiver
- Florida Standards
- State Board of Education Strategic Plan
- Differentiated Accountability Plans
- Recent legislation created a standard diploma option for students with significant cognitive disabilities - Section 1003.4282(11), Florida Statutes
- District and school improvement plans
- District professional development plans and teacher evaluation systems
- Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services strategic plan aligned with ESEA waiver, State Board of Education Plan and State Performance Plan (OSEP)

- o Focused monitoring in collaboration with differentiated accountability bureau, included focus and priority schools
- o All joint technical assistance contributes to actions in district improvement plan
- o Differentiated accountability teams include dedicate PSRTI-MTSS facilitator

2(e) Representatives Involved in SSIP Development and Implementation:

Staff from FLDOE were involved in the development of the SSIP. These individuals were considered internal stakeholders and were integrally involved in all Phase 1 components. A listing of the internal representatives, their offices, and positions is included in the chart below:

DOE Representative	Office/Division	Position
Monica Verra-Tirado	FLDOE – Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS)	Bureau Chief
Tonya Milton	FLDOE – BEESS – Legislative Policy	Program Planner/Analyst
April Katine	Resource and Information Center (BRIC)	Educational Program Director
Gail Munroe	Resource and Information Center (BRIC)	Program Specialist
Rethia Hudson	Resource and Information Center (BRIC)	Program Specialist
Aimee Mallini	FLDOE - Parent Services	Program Specialist
Laura Harrison	FLDOE - School Choice	Scholarship Program Director
Beth Moore	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Senior Educational Program Director
Anne Bozik	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – EBD
Laurie Epps	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – SLD
Leanne Grillot	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – Hearing and Vision Impaired
Diana McLendon	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – ASD
Janie Register	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – PreK
Carole West	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – IDEA Part C
Judith White	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Secondary Transition Specialist

Curtis Williams	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Juvenile Justice Educational Program Director
Bethany Mathers	FLDOE – Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – IND
Karen Hallinan	FLDOE- Instructional Support Services (ISS)	Program Specialist – Speech/Language
Heidi Metcalf	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Senior Educational Program Director
Vicki Eddy	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Program Specialist – Data Systems for District Monitoring
Marie Lacap	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Program Specialist – Data Systems for reporting
Annette Oliver	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Educational Program Director – Discretionary Projects Administrator
Cathy Howard-Williams	FLDOE- Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Jessica Brattain	FLDOE- Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Cathy Bishop	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Senior Educational Program Director
Patricia Howell	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Educational Program Director
Liz Conn	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Educational Program Director
Karlene Deware	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Karin Gerold	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Derek Hemenway	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Jackie Roumou	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist

Misty Bradley	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Jerry Brown	FLDOE - Dispute Resolution and Monitoring (DRM)	Program Specialist
Heather Diamond	FLDOE - Student Services Support (SSS)	Program Manager
Julie Collins	FLDOE - Safe Schools	Program Director
Wendy Stevens	FLDOE – Just Read!	Program Director
Jenna Evans	FLDOE, Bureau of School Improvement	Program Specialist IV
Dr. Jayna Jenkins	FLDOE - Student Services Support	MTSS Liaison
David Wheeler	FLDOE - Student Services Support (SSS)	School Psychology Consultant
Diane Mennitt	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	School Health Nurse Consultant
Thomas Garrett	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	Systems Liaison
Trevis Killen	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	School Social Work Consultant
Hope Williams	FLDOE - Bureau of Family and Community Outreach	Program Specialist
Lynn Turner	FLDOE - Bureau of Family and Community Outreach	Director Office of Dropout Prevention
Anne Glass	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	Program Planner / Analyst - Medicaid
David Lajeunesse	FLDOE – Bureau of Educator Certification and Educator	Bureau Chief
Eileen McDaniel	FLDOE – Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention	Bureau Chief
Angela Nathaniel	FLDOE – Office of Accountability and Assessment	Program Specialist – Florida Alternate Assessment
Veronica White	FLDOE – Bureau of Educational Certification	Policy Specialist
Curtis Jenkins	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	School Counseling Consultant
Helen Lancashire	FLDOE – Student Support Services (SSS)	School Counseling Consultant

David Darm	FLDOE – Division of Blind Services	Policy and External Affairs Consultant
Heidi Brennan	FLDOE – Bureau of Standards and Instructional Support	K-5 Mathematics and Science Education Program Specialist
LaCrest McCary	FLDOE – Office of Independent Education and Parental Choice	Educational Policy Director
Steven Barnes	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Program Specialist – Data Quality and Reporting
Sean Freeman	FLDOE - Program Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems (PAADS)	Program Specialist – IDEA Grants Part B
Wayne Jennings	FLDOE - Division of Blind Services	Transition Specialist

In addition to the internal representatives, the state involved external representatives from other state agencies, regional educational agencies, and LEAs in the development of Phase 1 components. Additional representatives included members (including parents of students with disabilities) of the State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students (SAC) and other parent and community groups. These agency and parent/community representatives are referred to as external stakeholders in other sections of this SSIP. A listing of the external representatives, their offices/agencies/affiliations, and positions is included in the chart below:

Representative/ Stakeholder	Office/Agency/Affiliation	Position
Denise Arnold	Florida Agency for Persons with Disabilities	Deputy Director for Programs
Karen Barber	Santa Rosa County District Schools	Director of Federal Programs
Amy Coltharp	Florida Department of Corrections	Government Operations
Laurie Blades	Florida Department of Children and Families	External Affairs Consultant
Johana Hatcher	Florida Department of Children and Families/ Office of Early Learning	Prevention Manager
Cindy Jones	Florida Department of Juvenile Justice	Government Analyst
Donna Phillips	Florida Developmental Disabilities Council	Education Program Manager
Richard LaBelle	Family Network on Disabilities	Executive Director
Shawn Larkin	Jackson County Schools	ESE Director

Kelly Rogers	Florida Department of Health/Early Steps	State Parent Consultant
Ann Siegel	Disability Rights Florida	Education Team Manager
Tracie Snow	Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind	Director of Curriculum and Staff Development
Jeanna Wanzek	Florida Center for Reading Research	Associate Professor
Roxana Beardall	Parent of a child with a disability	
Lauren Busto-Alban	Parent of a child with a disability	
Thea Cheeseborough	Parent of a child with a disability	
Hannah Ehrli	Parent of a child with a disability	
Enrique Escallon	Parent of a child with a disability	
Carin Knight-Floyd	Parent of a child with a disability	
Mark Halpert	Parent of a child with a disability	
Joni Harris	Parent of a child with a disability	
Nancy Linley-Harris	Parent of a child with a disability	
Michele Mantell	Parent of a child with a disability	
Mellisa Miller	Parent of a child with a disability	
Grace Roberts	Parent of a child with a disability	
Tracey Stevens	Parent of a child with a disability	
Robyn Walker	Parent of a child with a disability	
Catherine Rudniski	Person with a disability	
Kara Tucker	Person with a disability	

The members of the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC), who provide guidance on secondary transition and postsecondary issues, including graduation, are listed below.

Member Name	Project Represented	Position
Mary Ann Ahern	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS)	Administrator, ESE Special Projects

Sallie Bond	Department of Children and Families	Manager, Office of Child Welfare
Jill Brookner	Miami-Dade School District	Transition Supervisor
Rick Casey	Project 10:Transition Education Network	DJJ Consultant
Guenevere Crum	The Able Trust	Senior Vice President
Carly Detlefsen	Project 10:Transition Education Network	Regional Transition Representative
Cathy Einhorn	Learning Disabilities Association of Florida	Co-President
Lisa Friedman-Chavez	Project 10:Transition Education Network	Regional Transition Representative
Lori Garcia	Project 10:Transition Education Network	Director
Gina Geiger	Institute for Small and Rural Districts	Program Specialist
Christine Goulbourne	Family Network on Disabilities	Director of Programs
Kirk Hall	Vocational Rehabilitation	Transition Administrator
Rosalind Hall	Levy County Schools	ESE Director
LeeAnn Herman	Agency for Persons with Disabilities	State Office Employment Coordinator
Yolanda Herrera	Parent of a child with a disability	
Rusty Holmes	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System/ Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)	Project Manager
Bonnie Jerome	Royal Palm School	Assistant Principal
Alexander Jordan	Division of State Colleges	Coordinator of Equity, Access, and Campus Safety/Security
Cat Keen	Volunteer Florida	Director of National Service Programs
Tury Lewis	Project 10:Transition Education Network	Regional Transition Representative
Lynda Page	State University System	Assistant Director of Academic and Student Affairs

Donna Phillips	Florida Developmental Disabilities Council	Child Development and Education Program Manager
Beth Romans Corsi	Florida Developmental Disabilities Council	Program Manager Employment and Transportation Task Force
Jane Silveria	Career and Technical Education	State Supervisor Special Populations, Non-Traditional and Assessment
Frederico Valadez	Project 10:Transition Education Network	Regional Transition Representative

In addition to the external representatives, the state involved members of the Bureau Strategic Planning team, which included a diverse membership from various discretionary projects, in the development of Phase 1 components. The strategic plan team members are also referred to as external stakeholders in other sections of this SSIP. A listing of the strategic plan teams are in the table below:

Dispute Resolution and Monitoring
Best Practices for Appropriate Evaluation and Identification
Best Practices for Inclusion
Best Practices in Literacy and STEM
Best Practices for Positive Behavior/Student Engagement
Parent Involvement and Engagement
Prekindergarten
Teachers and Leaders
Transition/Postsecondary

A list of the strategic plan team members and their affiliations are in the table below:

Representative/ Stakeholder	Office/Agency/Affiliation	Position
Rose Lovannone	Florida Positive Behavior Support Project	Facilitator
Khush Jagus	Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavior Disabilities (SEDNET)	Project Administrator
Carmelina Hollingsworth	Resource Materials and Technology Center (RMTC – DHH)	Project Coordinator
Kristen Hope	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System Associate Centers (FDLRS)	Manager
Vicki Barnitt	Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)	Facilitator

Zoe Mahoney	Personnel Development Support Project	Program Analyst
Sheryl Sandvoss	Florida Inclusion Network	Project Manager
Shelby Robertson	Positive Behavior Support: Multi-tiered System of Supports (PBS:MTSS)	Learning and Development Facilitator
Catherine Raulerson	SEDNET	North Regional Manager
Jan Oberschlake	FDLRS	Manager
Mary Ann Ahearn	FDLRS	Project Administrator
Renee Speisman	Institute for Small and Rural Districts (ISRD)	Project Administrator
Batya Elbaum	ESE Parent Survey Support Project	Project Director
Chris Sarno	Piedra Data Systems	Program Administrator
Devon Minch	PBS:MTSS Project	Consultant FLPBS:MTSS
Eileen Gilley	Central Florida Parent Center (CFPC)	Director
Members	ESE Parent Stakeholder Workgroup	
Kathy Powell	Parents of the Panhandle Information Network (POPIN)	Director
Kyle Baldwin	SEDNET	Regional Coordinator
Lori Fahey	The Family Café	CEO
Max Corbin	The Family Cafe	Youth Advisor
Peg Sullivan	State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)	Project Director
Amy Lane	Child Find	Program Administrator
Kim Galant	Technical Assistance and Training System for Programs Serving Young Children with Disabilities (TATS)	Regional Facilitator
Sandy Smith	Technical Assistance and Training System for Programs Serving Young Children with Disabilities (TATS)	Project Director
Maggie Miller	Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)	Facilitator
Nikie Lindsey	Florida Office of Early Learning (FOEL)	School Readiness Program and Policy Inclusion Specialist
Sally Golden-McCord	Florida Department of Health – Children's Medical Services – Early Steps State Office (DOH-ESSO)	Early Steps Unit Director

Alice Kaye Emery	Working With the Experts (WWE)	Project Director
Donna Phillips	Florida Developmental Disabilities Council	Child Development/Education Program Manager
Nickie Zenn	SEDNET	South Regional Manager
Rusty Holmes	FDLRS	Human Resource Development
Christie Filakosky	Project Access	Program Manager
Randy LaRusso	Project Access	Project Manager
Clark Dorman	MTSS Project	Project Leader
David Davis	MTSS Project	Technology Project Coordinator
Jodi O'Meara	Florida Inclusion Network	Facilitator
Kitt Kelleher	FDLRS	Manager
Lisa Yount	MTSS Project	Regional Facilitator
Pam Sudduth	MTSS Project	Learning and Development Facilitator
Susan O'Rear	FDLRS	Manager
Suzanne Dalton	Florida Interactive Media Center – VI	Project Supervisor
George Batsche	MTSS Project	Principal Investigator
Kevin Smith	Florida Center for Reading Research	Associate in Research
Don Kincaid	PBS:MTSS	Director
Lezlie Cline	PDSP	Project Director

The Bureau/District Partners' committee is intended to ensure continued effective communication between the Bureau and districts in the areas of exceptional student education and student services, while at the same time being responsive to changes in federal laws and Department priorities. The partners assist the Bureau in the development/implementation of legislation, policy, and procedures.

Bureau/District Partners	Office/Division	Position
Lisa Rowland	Exceptional Student Education	Gilchrist County ESE Director
Debi Dukes	Exceptional Student Education	Union County ESE and Student Services Director

Dr. Lesley Salinero	Exceptional Student Education	Monroe County ESE and Student Services Director
Julie Kelsey	Exceptional Student Education	Citrus County ESE Director
Cathy Dofka	Exceptional Student Education	Hernando County ESE Director
Linda Novota	Exceptional Student Education	Santa Rosa County ESE Director
Judy Miller	Exceptional Student Education	Lake County ESE Director
Dawna Bobersky	Exceptional Student Education	Brevard County ESE Director
Maryann Parks	Exceptional Student Education	Hillsborough County ESE Director
Dr. Kimberly Steinke	Exceptional Student Education	Orange County ESE Director
Elizabeth Arnold	Student Support Services	Washington County ESE and Student Services Director
Tanya English	Student Support Services	Wakulla County ESE and Student Services Director
Katrina Townsend	Student Support Services	Flagler County Student Support Services Director
Barbara Casteen	Student Support Services	St. Lucie County ESE and Student Services Director
Terry Roth	Student Support Services	Clay County ESE Director
Robyn Marinelli	Student Support Services	Student Services Supervisor
Janice Tobias	Student Support Services	Lake County Student Services Director
Mason Davis	Student Support Services	Duval County Exceptional Education and Student Services Executive Director
Deborah Montilla	Student Support Services	Dade County Student Services District Director
Dr. Rosalind Hall	Florida Council for Administrators of Special Education	Levy County ESE and Student Services Director
Mark Vianello	Florida Association of Student Services and Administrators	Marion County Student Services Executive Director

2(f) Stakeholder Involvement:

Stakeholders, internal and external, were included in all components of the data analysis, beginning with the planning for Florida's Race to the Top initiative, ESEA Flex Waiver and development of the State Board of Education's Strategic Plan. Stakeholders included the State Advisory Council for Special Education and other stakeholder groups assembled specifically to support the FLDOE staff in

developing and implementing the goal of ensuring all students with disabilities graduate college, career and life ready. The state collaborated with stakeholders group consisting of parents, students, educators and administrators from representing districts, state agencies, advocacy groups, federally funded parent support groups, and members of the State Advisory Council. The SSIP stakeholder groups participated in data analysis and provided feedback on areas of concern regarding the performance of SWD and assisted in identifying the root causes of low performance. They also provided information about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the state's infrastructure.

Input was gathered through a variety of venues including, but not limited to:

- State Advisory Council for Special Education
- Parent, educator and other stakeholders feedback to the State Board of Education on Strategic Plan and ESEA Flexibility Waiver
- Round table meetings with district directors of special education and student services.
- On-site district focus groups including, students, teachers and administrators.
- SSTIC-State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee: includes parents, district personnel and others.
- Graduation Pathways Taskforce- included parents, district personnel and others.

Component #3 State Identified Measurable Results for Children with Disabilities

3(a) Identification of the SIMR for Students with Disabilities:

The FLDOE, in collaboration with its internal and external stakeholders, has identified the measurable result of increasing the statewide graduation rate for students with disabilities from 52.3% (2012-13 graduates) to 62.3% (2017-18 graduates) and closing the graduation gap (baseline 23.2 percentage points in 2012-13) for students with disabilities in half ($\leq$ 11.6 points)

The SIMR is related to SPP/APR results indicator #1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a standard diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

3(b) Basis for Selection of SIMR:

The state engaged in a systemic process that included a comprehensive review of data and infrastructure analysis. The basis for the selection of Florida's SIMR, as well as the alignment with current agency initiatives and priorities, is described in detail in the data and infrastructure analysis sections of the SSIP.

3(c) Student Level Outcome:

The state's identified SIMR, to increase the statewide graduation rate of students with disabilities and close the graduation gap, is a clear student level outcome. It is expected that addressing the SIMR will have a positive impact on improving results for all students with disabilities in the state.

Florida post-school outcomes data clearly demonstrate that students with disabilities who graduate with a standard diploma are more likely to be employed or enrolled in postsecondary education than students who do not.

Additionally, while the SIMR chosen is graduation rate, there is an expectation that positive changes must be made at all levels and in all areas to achieve this.

3(d) Stakeholder Involvement:

As described in detail in the data and infrastructure analysis sections of the SSIP, internal and external stakeholders were involved in selecting the SIMR. The FLDOE staff, in conjunction with internal and external stakeholders, established targets for FFY 2014 through FFY 2018. These targets are consistent with those identified through Florida's ESEA Waiver application process, which also included a variety of stakeholder input, as well as Florida's State Board of Education approval. The FFY 2018 target reflects measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data. During the process staff and stakeholders were committed to setting targets that reflected both rigorous and attainable outcomes.

3(e) Baseline and Targets:

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular (standard) diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The target for federal uniform graduation rate in Florida is 85% for all groups, or an increase of at least 2% per year. This means that the target graduation rate for students with disabilities, as listed below based on a simple 2% increase per year, will change yearly based on the previous year performance. For example, should the federal uniform graduation rate for students with disabilities increase 3.2 % in FFY

2014, to 55.5%, the target for FFY 2015 would increase to 57. 5%, the target for FFY 2016 to 59.5%, etc.

FFY
2013=52.30% (baseline-actual)
2014=54.30%
2015=56.30%
2016=58.30%
2017=60.30%
2018=62.30%

Component #4 -Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

4(a) Strategies Based on Data and Infrastructure Analysis:

Stakeholders, internal and external, were included in all components of the data analysis, beginning with the planning for Florida's Race to the Top initiative, ESEA Flex Waiver and development of the State Board of Education's Strategic Plan. Stakeholders included the State Advisory Council for Special Education and other stakeholder groups assembled specifically to support the state staff in developing and implementing the goal of ensuring all students with disabilities graduate college and career ready. The FLDOE collaborated with stakeholders group consisting of parents, students, educators and administrators from representing districts, state agencies, advocacy groups, federally funded parent support groups, and members of the State Advisory Council. The SSIP stakeholder groups participated in data analysis and provided feedback on areas of concern regarding the performance of SWD and assisted in identifying the root causes of low performance. They also provided information about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the state's infrastructure. From this work, a set of coherent improvement strategies that are based on the state's data and infrastructure analysis were identified in order to increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities with a standard high school diploma.

4(b) Evidence for Improvement Strategies:

Beginning in 2012, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services engaged stakeholders in conversation in order to review key evidence-based practices for systems improvement for state, districts and schools from What Matters Most: Moving Your Numbers (NCEO, 2012). Since that time the key practices have guided the relationships between SEA, LEA and other stakeholders towards continuous improvement of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request, Race to the Top, and the State Performance Plans for Students with Disabilities.
The six key practices identified are:
- Use data well
- Focus your goals
- Select and implement shared instructional practices
- Implement deeply
- Monitor and provide feedback and support
- Inquire and learn

Stakeholders also identified the need to address barriers to graduation by addressing all areas of the educational system, from pre-school to post school. Additionally, as identified in the root cause analysis the following areas were identified as specific barrier to students graduating college, career and life ready. This resulted in the need to shift from a compliance focused system to a results-driven system, with all members of the organization working towards the ultimate goal of graduating all students,

including students with disabilities, college, career and life ready. The Bureau worked with stakeholders to develop a strategic plan with specific evidence based action for each area of the system. The following section provides examples of strategies from each area of the strategic plan.

- **Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement**
  - Develop awareness information with regard to IEP facilitation (e.g., video for parents and other stakeholders, and an informational brochure).
  - Incorporate elements of meeting facilitation processes that promote successful meeting outcomes in IEP professional development (e.g., quality IEP training).
  - Develop and implement processes and supportive documentation for state-sponsored Facilitated IEP training.

- **Best Practices for Inclusion**
  - Participation/Time in General Education Setting (LRE). Percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day.
    - Update TAP documents related to LRE to include best practice for supporting facilitation, co-teaching, in class supports and class size implications for students with disabilities.
    - Develop an assessment tool utilizing Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) indicators to assess districts' status related to inclusion and LRE rates.
    - BEESS and Florida Inclusion Network will produce a training/guide on scheduling for in-class supports, to include student data analysis and alignment/implementation of service delivery models (co-teach, support facilitation).

- **Best Practices in Literacy and STEM**
  - Participation/Performance on Statewide Assessments that are focused on three priorities.
    1. Data-based planning and problem solving
    2. Effective instruction and interventions aligned with principles of Universal Design for Learning and Providing necessary access
    3. Critical learning supports
  - District teams will consistently and proficiently use a data-based process for continual improvement.
    - Develop, publish and market guidance and tools for instructional and organizational decision making
    - Design professional development for instructional personnel and education leaders
    - Provide data-based problem-solving expertise for Year Two on- site district supports and follow up supports to districts targeted in Year One.
  - Professional development providers will consistently and proficiently use an evaluation method to monitor impact.
    - Market the use of District/School Self-Assessment tools to provide data on leadership practices
    - Administer and report results of SEA Self-Assessment to evaluate implementation of leadership practices
    - Use District/School Self-Assessment data to inform BEESS and Project PD Plans
    - Complete a professional development evaluation model to be used consistently across providers

- Develop a student outcome reporting protocol and example tool that supports reporting outcome data in all three tiers of instruction/intervention

  o General education will be designed with a full range of options for students with disabilities.
    - Publish and disseminate technical assistance paper addressing specially designed instruction
    - Incorporate the specially designed instruction practices into printed and web-based resources for accessible instructional materials, assistive technology, differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning
    - Develop, publish and market an updated Accommodations Manual
    - Provide PD to ensure that instruction is accessible, engaging and aligned to individual student needs
    - Revise K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan to include explicit requirements related to specially designed instruction
  o Instructional delivery will be evidence based, ambitious and engaging.
    - Provide literacy and STEM-related PD to participants at the statewide, regional, district and school levels
    - Provide literacy and STEM-related expertise for Year Two on-site district supports and follow up supports to districts targeted in Year One
    - Publish and disseminate exemplars and provide professional development on the use of technology to create highly engaging literacy and STEM learning environments for the full range of learners
  o The full range of student needs will be supported to ensure engagement.
    - Build capacity for district implementation of evidence- based strategies (such as SIM) to increase proficiency rates
    - Develop a packaging and dissemination plan that promotes effective family and community engagement
    - Publish guidance on how to implement integrated student services learning supports within an MTSS

- **Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement**

  o Percentage 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: Preschool parents of students with disabilities report that school facilitates parental involvement.
    - Facilitate improved collaboration of districts and schools, agencies and communities to better coordinate ESE services provided to families/caregivers, which in turn will result in parents reporting that schools made greater efforts to engage them, as measured by the annual parent survey.
    - Review and evaluate existing partnerships to determine how each supports and impacts parental involvement and community engagement and ultimately affects student achievement.

- Provide information to parents of SWDs so they have the information they need to advocate for appropriate measurable goals for education, training, employment, etc. and that indicates student and outside agencies, as appropriate, were part of transition planning.

- **Best Practices for Prekindergarten**

    o Align and integrate standards and curricula from prekindergarten through grade 3 to improve the continuity of instruction, assessment and program improvement efforts throughout early childhood education.
    o Align Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards with the Florida Standards curricula and assessments as a continuum from prekindergarten through grade 3.
    o Facilitate collaboration with districts' community agencies and programs to identify families in need of parent and child find services.
    o Implement the problem-solving approach process to assist districts in implementation of inclusionary practices for prekindergarten children with disabilities.
        - Provide trainings/workshops with follow-up activities to facilitate inclusion; develop trainings and best practice briefs to address inclusion.
        - Provide technical assistance surrounding accurately reporting environmental codes.
        - Provide technical assistance and support to school district VPK programs identified as in need of support related to inclusion practices (e.g., behavior supports in inclusive settings).
        - Encourage service delivery models for related services (occupational, physical and speech therapy) that are contextual and ecologically based that serve children in their natural environments and provide collaborative consultation to the classroom staff who are primary caregivers.
        - Facilitate communications among school districts, FIMC-VI, FIN, FDLRS, CARD, VPK, Head Start, Early Learning Coalitions and other early childhood partners to overcome barriers and implement inclusion options.
    o Collaborate with community agencies to support the development of high-quality inclusive preschool programs and increase access to technical assistance providers to meet the needs of all children to reduce the number of families unable to access programs due to lack of placements or expulsions.

- **Best Practices for Teachers and Leaders**

    o Increase the knowledge and skills of all teachers working with SWDs.
        - Analyze existing data to determine areas of need.
        - Identify dispute issues and professional development needed for teachers and staff related to SWDs.
        - Market professional development for ALL teachers that builds their skills

to differentiate instruction, addresses the needs of diverse learners and relies on evidence-based practices (i.e., PDA courses).
- Develop online modules related to instruction for SWD (SB 1108 requirements).
- Include ESE content in GE pre-service programs (SB 1664 requirements).
o Increase the knowledge and skills of educational leaders related to SWD.
- Analyze existing data to determine areas of need.
- Include ESE content in Educational Leadership pre-service programs.

- **Best Practices for Transition/Postsecondary**

  o Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices known to impact graduation rate to school districts.
  o Collaborate with national and state partners to identify and plan support for graduation activities (e.g., NSTTAC).
  o Collaborate with BEESS Parent Services to:
    - Communicate to families, in a culturally and linguistically sensitive manner, the new graduation requirements
    - Increase awareness of options for students with disabilities to obtain a standard diploma (e.g., 5 and 6 year, post special diploma options for achieving standard diploma [for those who already have a special diploma] and virtual education)
  o Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices to school districts.
  o Collaborate with national and state partners to identify evidence- based practices and support current activities in the state (e.g., SPDG Check & Connect and Strategic Instruction Model [SIM]).
  o Collaborate with BEESS Parent Services to:
    - Communicate to families, in a culturally and linguistically sensitive manner, the importance of students with disabilities remaining in school.
    - Identify and communicate Choice options for students with disabilities (e.g., Virtual school and charter schools)
  o Increase postsecondary opportunities for students with intellectual disabilities in all Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities regions.
    - Establish and document data sources and collection method to determine baseline participation and set goals for future growth.
    - Support the expansion of the current programs on campuses of USFSP, UNF and Lynn University.
    - Provide support to other existing Transition and Postsecondary Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities (TPSID) programs.
    - Create new TPSID programs at other institutions of higher education.
    - Collaborate with BEESS Parent Services to increase parental awareness, in a culturally and linguistically sensitive manner, of options and involvement in planning for postsecondary education for students with intellectual disabilities.

4(c) Strategies that Address Root Cause and Framework Build Capacity to Support Systemic Change:

The following improvement strategies included in the state's SSIP are directly related to the root causes of low performance that were identified during the completion of data and infrastructure analysis components. As described previously, the improvement strategies are based on an implementation framework that will lead to and support systemic change.

- **Best Practices for Appropriate Evaluation and Identification**

  - Increase equitable outcomes and close the achievement gap by reducing inappropriate identification of black students as disabled.
  - Monitor state and district disproportionality patterns and trends.
    - Calculate district and state risk ratios data based on October Survey 2.
    - Review district data and identify districts with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.
  - Review and modify procedures for determining and monitoring disproportionality.
    - Evaluate and modify, as needed, formulas for determining disproportionality and inappropriate identification (e.g., "n" size; cut-off criteria)
    - Provide technical assistance and support on calculating risk ratios and using risk data to monitor disproportionate placement
    - Disaggregate EBD data by ethnicity and gender

  - Provide technical assistance on improving effectiveness of problem solving and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to reduce the need to label students as disabled.
    - Provide technical assistance on effective problem solving and tiered supports to selected districts
    - Identify exemplar districts and administer self-assessment to districts with the highest (> 3.0) and lowest (< 1.6) risk ratios and share effective practices
    - Develop and disseminate Intervention Effectiveness tool
  - Collaborate with Inclusion, Positive Behavior/Student Engagement, Parent Involvement and Pre-K workgroups to address systemic issues in disproportionality.
    - Coordinate intensive support with other performance indicators (BEESS District Support Plan) on on-site visits
    - Integrate support for targeted districts with disproportionality in discipline with Best Practices in Positive Behavior/Student Engagement
  - Provide professional development in diversity awareness and cultural sensitivity.
    - Identify three evidence-based trainings that districts can implement
    - Update and disseminate overview of disproportionality PowerPoint

- **Best Practices for Inclusion**

  - Facilitate targeted problem solving and action planning with districts related to improving inclusion and LRE rates.
  - Measure districts' progress on percentage of students with disabilities educated in the LRE and identify factors that contributed to its increase.

- **Best Practices for Positive Behavior/Student Engagement**

  - Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy (risk ratio of 3.0 or greater) in rates of suspension/expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year. (Relates to 4A)
  - Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy (risk ratio of 3.0 or greater) in rates of suspension/expulsions of students with IEPs by race or ethnicity for greater than 10 days. (Relates to 4B)
  - Discipline Data (CEIS): Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy (risk ratio of 3.5 or greater) in the rates of suspension/expulsions of students with IEPs.
  - Through collaboration with BEESS, discretionary projects and districts, provide data, technical assistance, effective problem solving, professional development and tiered supports to increase student engagement and reduce the need for restraint, seclusion, suspension and expulsion so students remain in class/school and successfully master Florida Standards.
  - Collect, compile and analyze district and state restraint, seclusion, suspension and expulsion data in order to inform decision making and district determinations.
  - Provide professional development opportunities related to issues of cultural diversity.
  - Collaborate with dispute resolution and monitoring to identify best practices and districts in need of assistance and to collect additional information and data related to SP&Ps.

- **Best Practices for Transition/Postsecondary**

  - Review and analyze current, trend and disaggregated data related to graduation rate and arrange districts in tiers based on performance. Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing and evaluating an action plan focused on **increasing the graduation rate** using the eight-step problem-solving process.
  - Review and analyze current, trend and disaggregated data related to drop out rate and arrange districts in tiers based on performance. Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing and evaluating an action plan focused on **decreasing the dropout rate** using the eight-step problem-solving process.
  - Evaluate data on district performance related to IEP non- compliance and arrange districts in tiers based on performance
  - Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices to school districts. Identify areas of need and develop a schedule of professional development activities designed to impact Indicator 13 outcomes (e.g., participation in PDA-ESE Transition Module, training in transition assessment, training in Secondary Transition and Compliance).
  - Increase the percentage of standard diploma graduates (SWDs) who enroll in college for AA, AS, AAS or in state and private university.
    - Examine postsecondary program data, including students with disabilities by program, etc.

- Increase participation of students with disabilities in dual enrollment and other accelerated programs.
- Increase access to postsecondary, career and technical education opportunities, including select STEM careers and adult education programs.
- Collaborate with BEESS Parent Services to increase parental awareness, in a culturally and linguistically sensitive manner, of options and involvement in planning for postsecondary education.

o Increase percentage of students who continue education at postsecondary level.
- Investigate special arrangements with postsecondary (e.g., develop articulation agreements with colleges and vocational/technical centers for the inclusion and support of students with disabilities working toward either special or standard diploma).

o Review and analyze current, trend and disaggregated data related to post-school outcomes and arrange districts in tiers based on performance.

o Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices, including those detailed below, to school districts.

o Collaborate with national and state partners to identify and plan support for student development activities (e.g., NSTTAC).

o Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing and evaluating an action plan focused on improving post school outcomes using the eight-step problem-solving process.

o Review inter-institutional agreements and interagency agreements to determine if provisions need to be changed or added to improve postsecondary outcomes (e.g., DEO partnerships). Support Employment First initiative via interagency collaboration.

o Collaborate with other agencies and interagency committees to encourage employers to hire individuals with disabilities.

o Increase the percentage of students with disabilities who earn at least one industry certification.
- Establish and document sources/method to gather Career and Technical Education (CTE) program evaluation data, including number of students with disabilities by program, etc.
- Expand CTE program options for all students with disabilities

4(d) Strategies to Support State Infrastructure and Support LEA Implementation:

As is expected of districts, the bureau uses Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) as the framework for planning bureau support to districts and allocating resources to meet the student performance goals, in accordance with FLDOE and the Bureau Strategic Plans and district-identified needs. A structured, problem-solving process is applied to address systemic and specific issues impacting educational outcomes of students with disabilities articulated in strategic goals. The work of Bureau teams is organized around a multi-tiered system of supports, and the bureau provides a continuum of supports (technical assistance, training, resources, evidence-based practices, technology, policies, etc.) to districts, school and families in order to improve student achievement. The SSIP has been developed to support the implementation and scaling up of the coherent improvement strategies addressed in this plan.

4(e) Stakeholder Involvement in Selecting Improvement Strategies:

As described throughout the SSIP multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in identifying improvement strategies necessary to ensure that all students with disabilities graduate from high school with a standard diploma, college, career and life ready. The FLDOE collaborated with stakeholders group consisting of parents, students, educators and administrators from representing districts, state agencies, advocacy groups, federally funded parent support groups, and members of the State Advisory Council. The SSIP stakeholder groups participated in data analysis and provided feedback on areas of concern regarding the performance of SWD and assisted in identifying the root causes of low performance. They also provided information about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the state's infrastructure. From this work, a set of coherent improvement strategies that are based on the state's data and infrastructure analysis were identified in order to increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities with a standard high school diploma.

Component #5 Theory of Action

5(a) Graphic Illustration
5(b) Impact of Improvement Strategies on the SIMR
5(c) Stakeholder Involvement in Developing the Theory of Action

Beginning in 2012, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services engaged multiple internal and external stakeholders, as listed in section 2, to review and utilize the key evidence-based practices for systems improvement for state, districts and schools from What Matters Most: Moving Your Numbers (NCEO, 2012). Since that time the key practices have guided the relationships between SEA, LEA and other stakeholders towards continuous improvement of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver Request, Race to the Top, and the State Performance Plan for Students with Disabilities and the SSIP.

The six key practices identified are:
- Use data well
- Focus your goals
- Select and implement shared instructional practices
- Implement deeply
- Monitor and provide feedback and support
- Inquire and learn

The FLDOE has created a graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the six key practices will increase the state's capacity to lead to meaningful change in LEAs. This theory of action illustrates the relationship between the improvement strategies and the impact on increasing the number of students with disabilities who graduate college and career ready.