

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

### Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR)

#### Part B Indicator Measurement Table<sup>1</sup>

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>  |  |   |
| 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.<br>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))  | <b>Data Source:</b><br>Same data as used for reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).<br><br><b>Measurement:</b><br>States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. | <i>Sampling is not allowed.</i><br><br>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.<br><br>Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain why.<br><br>Targets should be the same as the measurable annual objectives under Title I of the ESEA. |
| 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.<br>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))   | <b>Data Source:</b><br>State dropout data.<br><br><b>Measurement:</b><br>Explain calculation.  | <i>If State uses 618 data sampling is not allowed.</i><br><br>Use State-level dropout data.<br><br>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.<br><br>Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain why.   |
| 3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:<br><br>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's | <b>Data Source:</b><br>AYP data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA.<br><br><b>Measurement:</b><br>A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability   | Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.<br><br>States are encouraged to present their APR information in summary tables and include multiple years of data for comparison purposes.  |

<sup>1</sup> Monitoring Priorities, indicators, and measurements included on the *Part B Indicator Measurement Table* are to be used to populate designated sections of the SPP and APR Templates. Populated templates can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html>

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>   | <p>subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Participation rate percent = [(# of students participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of students enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all students, including both students enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of students with disabilities enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of students enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].</p> | <p>Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment results, i.e., link to the Web site where results are reported.</p> <p>Indicator 3.A: Report only on the AYP assessment targets for reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency, not targets for graduation or other elements of AYP. The definition of meeting the State's AYP targets for the disability sub-group is found in section 1111(b)(2)(C) of Title I of the ESEA.</p> <p>Indicator 3.B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all NCLB grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p> <p>Indicator 3.C: Proficiency calculations in this APR must result in one proficiency rate for each content area across all NCLB assessments (combining regular and all alternates) for all children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year. There should be two rates – one for reading/language arts covering all assessed grades and one for mathematics covering all assessed grades.</p> |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs of greater than 10 days in a</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days). Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as</p>  | <p><i>Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the State's examination of data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or</li> <li>• The rates of suspensions and expulsions for</li> </ul>  |

**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>school year by race and ethnicity and that have policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p> | <p>having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity and that have policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> | <p>children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs.</p> <p>In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>For 4A, if discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>For 4B, if discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>Targets must be 0% for 4B.</p> <p>Section B of this indicator is new for FFY 2009. Baseline, targets and improvement activities to be provided with the FFY 2009 APR due February 1, 2011.</p> |
| <p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40%</p>  | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 3 of Information Collection 1820-0517 (Part B, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Implementation of FAPE Requirements).</p>   | <p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2008 and due on February 2, 2009. Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare</p>  |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>of the day; and</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>  | <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> | <p>the results to the target.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3, explain.</p>   |
| <p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>  | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 3 of Information Collection 1820-0517 (Part B, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Implementation of FAPE Requirements).</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>  | <p><i>For this indicator, report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2008 and due on February 2, 2009. Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3, explain.</p> <p>In the FFY 2008 submission, due February 1, 2010, establish a new baseline, targets and, as needed, improvement activities for this indicator using the 2008-2009 data.</p> |
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>State selected data source.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills</p>  | <p><i>Sampling of <b>children for assessment</b> is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes</p>  |

**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |                         |                         |                         |   |   |   |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.<br/>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>  | <p>(including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p> <p>a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable</p> | <p>to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States will provide baseline and targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for baseline for FFY 2008 and six numbers for targets for each of the FFYs 2009 and 2010).</p> <p>For FFYs 2008, 2009 and 2010, provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes. Provide baseline, targets and Summary Statement data as noted in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1333 617 1963 1047"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1333 617 1617 711">FFY 2008:<br/>Due 2/1/10</th> <th data-bbox="1617 617 1789 711">FFY 2009:<br/>Due 2/1/11</th> <th data-bbox="1789 617 1963 711">FFY 2010:<br/>Due 2/1/12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1333 711 1617 1047">Report progress data and establish baseline (two Summary Statements for three Outcomes – six numbers) for FFY 2008 and six targets for each of the FFYs 2009 and 2010</td> <td data-bbox="1617 711 1789 1047">Report progress data; calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets</td> <td data-bbox="1789 711 1963 1047">Report progress data: calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a scored of 6 or 7 on the COSF.</p> <p>In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF.</p> <p>The Early Childhood Outcomes Center has resources to assist States in submitting their early childhood outcomes data including a reporting</p> | FFY 2008:<br>Due 2/1/10 | FFY 2009:<br>Due 2/1/11 | FFY 2010:<br>Due 2/1/12 | Report progress data and establish baseline (two Summary Statements for three Outcomes – six numbers) for FFY 2008 and six targets for each of the FFYs 2009 and 2010 | Report progress data; calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets | Report progress data: calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets |
| FFY 2008:<br>Due 2/1/10   | FFY 2009:<br>Due 2/1/11   | FFY 2010:<br>Due 2/1/12  |                         |                         |                         |   |   |   |
| Report progress data and establish baseline (two Summary Statements for three Outcomes – six numbers) for FFY 2008 and six targets for each of the FFYs 2009 and 2010 | Report progress data; calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets   | Report progress data: calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets  |                         |                         |                         |   |   |   |

**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p><b>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):</b></p> <p><b>Summary Statement 1:</b> Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p><b>Measurement for Summary Statement 1:</b></p> <p>Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.</p> <p><b>Summary Statement 2:</b> The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p><b>Measurement for Summary Statement 2:</b></p> <p>Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.</p> | <p>template and a calculator tool for calculating the summary statements. These tools are available at: <a href="http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ECO/">http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ECO/</a></p>   |
| <p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>State selected data source.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of</p>   | <p><i>Sampling of parents to receive the survey is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|---|---|
| (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))  | improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.   | <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Include a description of how the State has ensured that the response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>If the State is using a separate survey for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.</p> <p>If States are using a survey and the survey is revised or a new survey is adopted, States must submit a copy with the APR.</p>   |
| <b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation</b>  |   |   |
| <p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 1 of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State’s analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2006,</p> | <p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data for all children with disabilities.</p> <p>Provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to <a href="mailto:IDEAdata@westat.com">IDEAdata@westat.com</a> or phoning 1-888-819-7024.</p> <p>Describe the method(s) used to calculate</p> |

**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p> | <p>disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p>   |
| <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 1 of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State's analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate</p>   | <p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Provide the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic</p> |



**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>representation.”</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2006, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p> | <p>groups in specific disability categories and the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to <a href="mailto:IDEAdata@westat.com">IDEAdata@westat.com</a> or phoning 1-888-819-7024.</p> <p>Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> |
| <p><b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>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</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an</p>   | <p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire</i></p>  |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.<br/>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p> | <p>average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p> <p>b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> | <p><i>reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures, and provide a copy of any checklists, questions or criteria used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d) the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) A child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> |
| <b>Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition</b>                        |   |  |
| 12. Percent of children referred by Part C  | <b>Data Source:</b>   | <i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the</i>   |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.<br/>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>   | <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to 637(a)(9)(A)) for Part B eligibility determination.</p> <p>b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.</p> <p>c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.</p> <p>e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.</p> <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.</p> | <p><i>method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures, and provide a copy of any checklists, questions or criteria used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>For the FFY 2008 APR submission, States are not required to include Measurement (e) in the calculation.</p> |
| <p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of</p>   | <p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures, and provide a copy of any checklists, questions or criteria used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used</p>   |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>  | <p>study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.</p>  | <p>in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table for the previous APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 submission, due February 1, 2011, establish a new baseline for this indicator using the 2009-2010 data.</p>  |
| <p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b><br/>State selected data source.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs</p> | <p><i>Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Collect data by September 2009 on students who left school during 2007-2008, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2007-2008 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. These include all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular or modified diploma, dropped out, or aged out. Describe how the above leavers are included in the sample.</p> <p>A. To be considered enrolled in higher education,</p> |

**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Data Source and Measurement   | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
|                                      | <p>in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> | <p>youth must have been enrolled full- or part-time for at least 1 complete term, at anytime in the year since leaving high school, in a program to earn a degree or certificate or prepare for gainful employment in a recognized occupation in a community college or college/university or other institution that meets the definition of Institution of Higher Education in the Higher Education Act (HEA).</p> <p>B. When reporting enrollment in higher education, use the definition in A.</p> <p>To be considered competitively employed, youth must have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes the military.</p> <p>C. When reporting enrollment in higher education, use the definition in A.</p> <p>To be considered enrolled in other postsecondary education or training, youth must have been enrolled full- or part-time for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, workforce development program or certificate program).</p> <p>When reporting on individuals who were competitively employed, use the definition in B.</p> <p>To be considered in some other employment, youth must have worked for pay, worked in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.), or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school.</p> <p>Describe the calculations and results using actual numbers and compare these results to the target. Include a description of how the State has ensured</p> |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>that survey data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.</p> <p>In the FFY 2009 submission, due February 1, 2011, establish a new baseline, targets and, as needed, improvement activities for this indicator.</p>  |
| <b>Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision</b>  |  |  |
| <p>15. 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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring, complaints, hearings and other general supervision system components. Indicate the number of agencies monitored using different components of the State's general supervision system.</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>a. # of findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).</p> | <p><i>Describe the process for selecting LEAs for monitoring.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific level of noncompliance.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Report on the number of findings of noncompliance made in 2007 – 2008 (July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008) and corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from identification. In presenting the compliance data, disaggregate the findings by components of the State's general supervision system, including monitoring (on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits, data reviews) and dispute resolution (complaints and due process hearings). Findings must also be disaggregated by SPP/APR indicator and other areas of noncompliance. Describe the other areas of noncompliance.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous APR, including any revisions to general supervision procedures, technical assistance provided and/or any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on</p> |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed, and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>Provide detailed information regarding the correction of noncompliance related to a specific indicator under the specific indicator, e.g., correction of noncompliance related to early childhood transition would be described under Indicator 12.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> |
| <p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.</p> | <p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance with complaint resolution timeline requirements.</p> <p>Attach Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 7, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>   |
| <p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>  | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.</p> | <p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance.</p> <p>Attach Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677.</p>   |

## Part B – SPP /APR (2)

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 7, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>  |
| <p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>                  | <p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%.</p> <p>Attach Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 7, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>   | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p> | <p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express</p>  |



**Part B – SPP /APR (2)**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators  | Data Source and Measurement  | Instructions for Indicators/Measurement   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>their targets in a range, e.g., 75-85%.</p> <p>Attach Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 7, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>   |
| <p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p> | <p><b>Data Source:</b></p> <p>State selected data sources, including data from State data system and SPP/APR</p> <p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and</li> <li>b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.</li> </ul> <p>States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).</p> | <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100% for timeliness and accuracy.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the actions the State is taking to ensure compliance. Describe the State's mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> |