

Attachment 1: Part B Indicator 15 Worksheet

Instructions for Completing the B-15 Worksheet

Indicator B-15 is to determine whether the State's general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification (notification to the public agency that the State has concluded that the public agency is not complying with a statutory or regulatory provision). This indicator is measured as the percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification.

States are directed to reflect monitoring data collected through the components of the State's general supervision system, including on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits, data reviews, complaints, due process hearings, etc. Additionally, according to the OSEP Instructions for the Indicators/Measurement table, States are to group areas of noncompliance by monitoring priority areas and areas of noncompliance.

Key Terms

- **Monitoring Activities** are described in the document *Developing and Implementing an Effective System of General Supervision: Part B (January 2007)* and *FAQs Regarding Identification and Correction (August 2008)*. Specific activities of monitoring include, but are not limited to local education agency (LEA) self-assessments or local annual performance reports, data reviews, desk audits, on-site visits or other activities to ensure compliance.
- **Dispute Resolution: Hearings and Complaints** are also described in the General Supervision document referenced above. These include the tracking of timely correction of noncompliance identified through complaints and due process actions. States must include any noncompliance identified in a due process hearing decision, whether or not the parent prevailed in the hearing.
- **Finding** is defined as a written notification from the State to an LEA that contains the State's conclusion that the LEA is in noncompliance, and that includes the citation of the regulation and a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data supporting the State's conclusion of noncompliance with the regulation.
- **Correction** is defined as the State requiring the LEA to revise any noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices and the State verifies through follow-up review of data, other documentation and/or interviews that the noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices have been revised and the noncompliance has been corrected. The State should notify the LEA in writing that the noncompliance is corrected. For purposes of the SPP/APR reporting, timely correction occurs when noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the identification of noncompliance.

Organization of the B-15 Worksheet:

- **The worksheet is organized by individual indicators or clusters of indicators.**
 - o **Note:** When indicators are "clustered" the State does not need to report separately on each indicator in the cluster. Rather, the number of LEAs, numbers of findings, etc. should be grouped within that cluster.

- **There are five columns on the worksheet:**
 1. Indicator/Indicator Clusters
 2. General Supervision System Components
 3. Number of LEAs Issued Findings (including public agencies, such as correctional facilities and State schools that are not established as LEAs, e.g., school for the deaf)
 4. Number of Findings of noncompliance identified
 5. Number of Findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification

- **For each indicator/indicator cluster, there are two sub-rows that are repeated:**
 - o Monitoring Activities
 - o Dispute Resolution

Completing the Worksheet:

Column 1 - Indicator/Indicator Cluster Column - Lists the SPP/APR indicators individually or within a cluster of indicators. At the end of the worksheet, there are additional rows titled - *Other areas of noncompliance (can be grouped topically)*. These rows may be used by a State to list other areas of noncompliance that the State has not reported under other indicators/ indicator clusters. The State must list the area of noncompliance.

Column 2 - General Supervision Components Column – Represents all elements that comprise the State’s Monitoring Activities and Dispute Resolution processes. The first sub-row of Monitoring Activities may include Self-Assessment, Local APR, Data Reviews, Desk Audits, or On-Site Visits. This sub-row also has an “Other” option to indicate the list of monitoring activities may not be all inclusive. The second sub-row refers to the Dispute Resolution: Complaints and Hearings processes.

Column 3 - Number of LEAs Issued Findings of Noncompliance – Represents the number of LEAs for which the State identified through a written conclusion or report findings of noncompliance. The date of the written conclusion(s) or report of findings to the LEA is used to report the number LEAs monitored, not the date of the monitoring activity.

Notes:

- o An LEA may have an onsite visit in one fiscal year and the written notification of findings of noncompliance is sent to the LEA in the next fiscal year.
- o Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) begins July 1 of each year and ends June 30 of the next year.

Column 4 - (a) Number of Findings of noncompliance identified – Represents the number of identified findings of noncompliance for the indicator/indicator cluster. States must include every finding of noncompliance with a requirement of the IDEA in their data for Indicators C9/B15. The date of the written conclusion or report of findings to the LEA is used, not the date of the monitoring activity. The same FFY date range is used for Column 3 and Column 4.

Column 5 - (b) Number of Findings of noncompliance for which Correction was Verified no later than one year from identification – Represents the number of findings from Column 4 for which the State verified correction no later than one year from identification.

Sum the numbers down Column 4 and Column 5.

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification – Divide the sum of Column 5 by the sum of Column 4 and multiply 100.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
8. Percent of parents with a	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
	Monitoring Activities:			

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit,			

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (7/1/06 to 6/30/07)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
Other areas of noncompliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
Other areas of noncompliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
Other areas of noncompliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings			
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b				
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	