

The purpose of this document is to provide the public with a concise and accessible explanation and rationale for the proposed revisions to 1820-0624: IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (Part B SPP) and Annual Performance Report (Part B APR), collectively SPP/APR. The proposed revisions would take effect with States' FFY 2020 SPP/APR to be submitted in February 2022. The explanation is accompanied by two appendices. Appendix A lays out the legal requirements, i.e., elements of the SPP/APR that are required by statute and may not be changed. Appendix B describes prior significant revisions to the SPP/APR.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE FFY2020-FFY2025 PART B SPP/APR

OSEP is proposing revisions to the current Part B SPP/APR. This information collection package would also establish a new Part B SPP consistent with IDEA section 616(b)(1)(C) which requires each State to review its SPP at least once every six years. The SPP would cover the reporting years from FFY2020 through FFY2025.

The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) is committed to improving early childhood, educational, and employment outcomes and to raising expectations for all people with disabilities, their families, their communities, and the nation. In September 2018, OSERS released its framework which prioritizes rethinking all aspects of how OSERS serves infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families. It highlights OSERS commitment to support States in their work to raise expectations and improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities; provide States the flexibility they need to implement their programs in conformity with the IDEA; and partner with parents, individuals with disabilities, and diverse stakeholders.

OSEP began the process of rethinking all its systems, policies, and requirements that could be barriers to children with disabilities receiving a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. In doing so, OSEP operationalized its framework on its current system for providing IDEA-related supports to States, and for monitoring IDEA implementation in States: Results Driven Accountability (RDA). RDA, introduced in 2012, consists of three components, the SPP/APR, IDEA section 616(d) determinations, and differentiated monitoring and support.

OSEP is rethinking RDA to ensure it is in the best position to support the improvement of early childhood and educational outcomes and raise expectations for children and youth with disabilities, and their families. OSEP acknowledges that States, local educational agencies, and parents know best the needs of their children, and the systems and structures used to support them. Therefore, OSEP held 18 listening sessions, and accepted written input, on the current SPP/APR and suggestions for improvement. The proposed revisions to the SPP/APR are responsive to stakeholder input and provide our State and local partners with as much flexibility and support as possible so they can ensure that the needs of children with disabilities are being met. Finally, these proposed revisions take necessary steps to elevate parent voice in special education and related services provided under IDEA Part B.

Parents play a critical role in their children's education. The family is a child's first educator and is best equipped to make decisions. Therefore, consistent with the Secretary's priorities and OSERS rethink framework, OSEP is proposing to require States to examine parent participation rates in surveys, in addition to the representativeness of those participating, to ensure that each

State is receiving quality, actionable information from the most and varied parent voices as possible. The information families provide is critical to helping States evaluate the effectiveness of their systems. It is this parent and State partnership that will ensure raised expectations and improved outcomes for each child with a disability and their families.

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

The proposed revisions are as follows:

Current Indicator: Number and Topic / Scope of Change	Proposed Indicator Number	Proposed Revisions
1: Graduation		<p>This indicator will be revised to require States to report the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA and which the Department uses as part of the annual determinations under section 616 of the IDEA. Using the section 618 exiting data as the data source for this indicator allows direct focus on the outcomes of students with disabilities who received special education and related services at the time they exited high school based on the same standards and criteria for graduation that students without disabilities are required to meet. In addition, utilizing the section 618 exiting data allows OSEP to maintain consistent reporting instructions for this indicator across the 60 Part B reporting entities, since all the outlying areas and freely associated States report the Part B exiting data, but do not report the adjusted cohort graduation rate data under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).</p> <p>Further, these data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for all States.</p> <p>OSEP made a revision for clarity and consistency in the instructions for describing the conditions that all youth, and youth with individualized education programs (IEPs), must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.</p>
2: Drop Out		<p>OSEP made a revision for clarity and consistency in the instructions for describing what counts as dropping out for all youth and youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The measurement table has permitted States to choose between two different options in reporting drop-out data under Indicator 2. The measurement and instructions will be revised to require all States, beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, to use a single measurement for this indicator – the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA and that the Department uses as part of the annual determinations under section 616 of the IDEA.</p>

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

		These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.
3A: Assessment		Indicator 3A has been held in reserve since 2017. The indicator originally measured the percent of districts with a disability subgroup that met the State’s minimum “n” size that met the State’s adequate yearly progress (AYP) /annual measurable objective (AMO) targets for the disability subgroup. ESEA removed these requirements. Therefore, it is no longer necessary to hold this indicator number in reserve.
New: Assessment Participation rates for children with IEPs.	3A	<p>Historically, when reporting on the participation rates of children with disabilities under Indicator 3B in its SPP/APR submission, States were required to report inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school) for children with IEPs. This measurement has been revised to require States to report on participation rates for children with IEPs in grades 4, 8, and high school.</p> <p>Focusing on these three grade levels will provide the following advantages: (1) mitigates or prevents the masking of high performance/low performance or improvement/no improvement that would occur if all grades are combined to generate an “average;” (2) focuses on the effectiveness of early elementary instruction (e.g., K-3 literacy programs), which is a critical time in literacy development; (3) focuses on the successful transition of students with disabilities from middle/junior high school to high school; and (4) continues to focus on high school, which is a critical time for students with disabilities transitioning to adult life.</p> <p>This measurement requiring reporting on participation rates has been moved to Indicator 3A since that indicator number is no longer in reserve.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.</p>
New: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.	3B	Historically, when reporting on the proficiency rates of children with disabilities under Indicator 3C in its SPP/APR submission, States were required to report proficiency rates against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school) for children with IEPs. This measurement has been revised to require States to report on proficiency rates for children with IEPs in grades 4, 8,

		<p>and high school who are assessed against grade level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Focusing on these three grade levels will provide the following advantages: (1) mitigates or prevents the masking of high performance/low performance or improvement/no improvement that would occur if all grades are combined to generate an “average;” (2) focuses on the effectiveness of early elementary instruction (e.g., K-3 literacy programs), which is a critical time in literacy development; (3) focuses on the successful transition of students with disabilities from middle/junior high school to high school; and (4) continues to focus on high school, which is a critical time for students with disabilities transitioning to adult life.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.</p>
<p>New: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>3C</p>	<p>Historically, when reporting on the proficiency rates of children with disabilities under Indicator 3C in its SPP/APR submission, States were required to report proficiency rates against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school) for children with IEPs. This measurement has been revised to require States to report on proficiency rates for children with IEPs in grades 4, 8, and high school who are assessed against alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Focusing on these three grade levels will provide the following advantages: (1) mitigates or prevents the masking of high performance/low performance or improvement/no improvement that would occur if all grades are combined to generate an “average;” (2) focuses on the effectiveness of early elementary instruction (e.g., K-3 literacy programs), which is a critical time in literacy development; (3) focuses on the successful transition of students with disabilities from middle/junior high school to high school; and (4) continues to focus on high school, which is a critical time for students with disabilities transitioning to adult life.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.</p>

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

<p>New: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards</p>	<p>3D</p>	<p>This measurement has been added to require States to calculate a proficiency rate gap for children with IEPs in grades 4, 8, and high school who are assessed against grade level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Focusing on these three grade levels will provide the following advantages: (1) mitigates or prevents the masking of high performance/low performance or improvement/no improvement that would occur if all grades are combined to generate an “average;” (2) focuses on the effectiveness of early elementary instruction (e.g., K-3 literacy programs), which is a critical time in literacy development; (3) focuses on the successful transition of students with disabilities from middle/junior high school to high school; and (4) continues to focus on high school, which is a critical time for students with disabilities transitioning to adult life.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.</p>
<p>4A: Suspension / Expulsion All children with IEPs 4B: Suspension / Expulsion Race/Ethnicity</p>		<p>OSEP will make four revisions for clarity and consistency. The indicator language and the measurement are revised to replace the term “district” with “local educational agency (LEA)” to align with section 612(a)(22) of IDEA and to use a consistent term across all aspects of the indicator, <i>i.e.</i>, indicator, data source, measurement, and instructions. Additionally, OSEP has added “as defined by the state,” after each reference to significant discrepancy to clarify that the term “significant discrepancy” is defined by the State. OSEP proposes to revise the instructions to define “long-term suspensions and expulsions” as “more than 10 days during the school year,” which is consistent with how the State’s discipline data is collected under IDEA section 618. Finally, the indicator measurement and instructions have been revised to include “cell size” in addition to “n size.” This revision aligns the reporting requirements with similar requirements in Indicators 9 and 10 and is responsive to States’ request.</p>
<p>5: LRE</p>		<p>This indicator will be revised to align with the changes to ED<i>Facts</i> file specification DG74/C002 which will require States to submit child count and educational environments data for n and/or cell size for five-year-olds in kindergarten under the above-referenced file</p>

		<p>specification.</p> <p>Historically, all five-year-olds receiving special education and related services, regardless of environment, were counted in <i>EDFacts</i> file specification DG613/C089 (unduplicated number of children with disabilities (IDEA) ages 3 through 5).</p> <p>States have repeatedly requested that they be permitted to report separately on the number of five-year-olds in preschool and the number of five-year-olds in kindergarten. The <i>EDFacts</i> file specifications have not allowed for this separation; therefore, these data were not available to include in Indicators 5 (school age LRE) and 6 (preschool LRE). Based on the <i>EDFacts</i> information collection package (1850-0925), approved by OMB in September 2019, OSEP will require States to submit the count of five-year-old children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in kindergarten with the data on school-aged children with disabilities (ages 6-21) receiving special education and related services in <i>EDFacts</i> file 002. Additionally, States will be required to report the five-year-old children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in kindergarten disaggregated by the school-age educational environment categories (e.g., Inside regular class 80% or more of the day, Inside regular class 40% through 79% of the day, Separate School). Therefore, OSEP is proposing that States include only five-year-olds receiving services in kindergarten under this indicator. This change aligns SPP/APR reporting with the proposed <i>EDFacts</i> reporting and is responsive to public input.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the States.</p>
6: Preschool LRE		<p>This indicator will be revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disaggregate reporting by discrete age (3, 4, and 5); • add category C to require reporting on preschool children with disabilities who receive special education and related services in the home; and • allow States to report under this indicator only those five-year-olds who are enrolled in a preschool program. Five-year-olds who are enrolled in kindergarten will be reported under Indicator 5. <p>States currently report by preschool educational environments data by discrete age and</p>

	<p>special education and related services received in the home for <i>EDFacts</i> file specification DG613/C089 (089). These data are also publicly available at https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html#bccee.</p> <p>Reporting by, and setting targets for, discrete ages provides data transparency and makes the data more accessible to the public. It will facilitate a State’s analysis of trends in placements of preschool children with disabilities and may assist a State in ensuring that all placements are made in conformity with the least restrictive environment requirements and based on the individual needs of the child.</p> <p>States are required to report on the number of children with disabilities ages three, four, and five receiving special education and related services in the home under 089, but have not been required to provide this number for Indicator 6. States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. Adding the category “home” aligns the SPP/APR with the <i>EDFacts</i> data collection tools and provides transparency. Many young children with disabilities, especially those who are ages three and four, receive special education and related services in the home, yet this information has not been captured or analyzed in the SPP/APR.</p> <p>States have requested that they be permitted to report separately on the number of five-year-olds in preschool programs and the number of five-year-olds in kindergarten. The <i>EDFacts</i> file specifications have not allowed for this separation; therefore, these data were not available to include in Indicators 5 (school age LRE) and 6 (preschool LRE). Based on the <i>EDFacts</i> information collection package (1850-0925), approved by OMB in September 2019, OSEP will require States to submit the count of five-year-old children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in kindergarten with the data on school-aged children with disabilities (ages 6-21) in <i>EDFacts</i> file 002 and the count of five-year-old children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in preschool programs with the data on preschool-aged children with disabilities in <i>EDFacts</i> file 089. Therefore, OSEP is proposing that States include only five-year-olds receiving special education and related services in a preschool program under this indicator. This change aligns SPP/APR reporting with the proposed <i>EDFacts</i> reporting and is responsive to public input.</p> <p>These data will be prepopulated into the SPP/APR reporting tool to reduce burden for the</p>
--	--

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

		States.
7: Preschool Outcomes		No Change
8: Parent Involvement		<p>A foundational principle of the IDEA is to enhance the capacity of all parents to meaningfully participate in educational decision making regarding their children with disabilities. Research and experience have demonstrated that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families of children with disabilities have meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at school and at home. States collect parent involvement data as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, as well as to know if the State is supporting parents in meeting this goal. High quality data is necessary for States to make decisions about their program regarding parent involvement, including programmatic improvements. High quality data for this indicator means data that accurately represents the demographics of children receiving special education services. In order to report high quality data, OSEP believes that States must consider race and ethnicity when analyzing the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of children with disabilities.</p> <p>States will collect and submit data on the 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. The State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities. The indicator instructions will be revised to require States to compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented. States must also describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).</p> <p>Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative</p>

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

		of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race and ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.
9: Disproportionate Representation		No Change
10: Disproportionate Representation Race/Ethnicity		No Change
11: Child Find		No Change
12: Early Childhood Transition		No Change
13: Secondary Transition		<p>OSEP proposes to revise the indicator and the measurement to clarify that there must be evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>A requirement of secondary transition planning is to ensure that a student’s IEP includes those transition services needed to assist the child in reaching the student’s postsecondary goals. 34 CFR §300.320(b)(2). Including the participating agency that is likely to be providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, facilitates the transition of the student from special education and related services to receiving vocational rehabilitation services from the participating agency, and clarifies the types of participating agencies that should be included in IEP meetings if a purpose of the meeting will be consideration of postsecondary goals and secondary transition services.</p>

<p>14: Post-School Outcomes</p>	<p>This indicator will be revised to provide flexibility on the definition used for competitive employment.</p> <p>Beginning with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, States may continue to use two options when defining competitive employment. Option 1 is to use the same definition that the State used in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, <i>i.e.</i>, competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment. Option 2 requires the State to align its definition with the term “competitive integrated employment” as it is defined in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.</p> <p>Beginning with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, States must provide the total number of targeted children in the sample or census. States must also address any problems with response rates that could lead to nonresponse bias, thus impacting the validity of the data.</p> <p>The indicator instructions will be revised to require that States compare the current year’s response rate to the previous year’s response rate and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented. States must also describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).</p> <p>Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States collect post-school outcomes data as a way of measuring improved educational outcomes and functional results for children with disabilities. High quality data is necessary for States to make decisions about their program regarding post-school outcomes. High quality data for this indicator means data that accurately represents the</p>
---------------------------------	--

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2020

		demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. In order to report high quality data, OSEP believes that States must consider race and ethnicity when analyzing the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.
15: Resolution Sessions		No Change
16: Mediations		No Change
17: SSIP		OSEP has observed that SSIP reports range from less than 50 pages to more than 200 pages; and that some reports, while voluminous, may not provide a concise, cohesive, easily understandable and transparent report of a State’s progress. OSEP proposes to provide an optional streamlined template that States will use for SSIP Phase III reporting, which will reduce burden.

Appendix A: Legal Requirements

SPP/APR: Section 616(b)(1)(A) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA or Act) requires that, not later than one year after the date of enactment of IDEA Improvement Act of 2004, each State have in place an IDEA Part B SPP that evaluates the State’s efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B and describes how the State will improve such implementation. IDEA section 616(b)(1)(C) requires each State to review its SPP at least once every six years. Consistent with IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii), each State must report annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan, and to the Secretary on the State’s performance under the SPP, *i.e.*, an APR.

Indicators: As required by section 616(a)(3) of the Act,¹ the SPP is comprised of quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and qualitative indicators as needed to adequately measure performance in the following priority areas –

- The provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE)
- State exercise of its general supervisory authority including –
 - o Child find
 - o Effective monitoring
 - o The use of resolution sessions and mediation; and
 - o A system of transition services as defined in IDEA sections 602(34) and 637(a)(9)
- Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification

The SPP also includes indicators that are not specifically required by section IDEA 616(a)(3), such as the indicators related to suspension and expulsion and parent involvement, that address areas critical to ensuring improved educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. See IDEA section 616(a)(4).

Targets: The State must establish measurable and rigorous targets for each indicator. See IDEA section 616(b)(2)(A).

Improvement: Pursuant to IDEA section 616(b)(1)(A), the SPP must include a description of how the State will improve its implementation of IDEA.

Information Regarding Slippage Where the Targets Are Not Met:

Section 80.40(b)(2) of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, or EDGAR, required that the States’ APRs include brief information on the reasons for slippage if the established objectives, *i.e.*, targets, were not met. This section of EDGAR was replaced by the Uniform Guidance provision in 2 CFR §200.328(b)(2)(ii), which requires that, unless other

¹ See also: IDEA sections 612(a)(15), 612(a)(16), 612(a)(22), and 616(a)(4).

collections are approved by OMB, the States' APRs include brief information on the reasons why the State did not meet its established goals, *i.e.*, targets, if appropriate. The Department proposes to maintain the requirement in the current instructions, approved by OMB in 2012, that States must include an explanation of slippage in indicators where the State did not meet its target.

Appendix B: Prior Significant Milestones or Revisions

2005

The IDEA Part B SPP/APR package (Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number (04736) 1820-0624) was originally approved by OMB in 2005. The original IDEA Part B SPP/APR package contained 20 indicators covering the areas required by the Act and other key areas. Some indicators corresponded to the statutory language in IDEA section 616(a)(3), *e.g.*, Indicators 9 and 10 regarding the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services to the extent that representation is due to inappropriate identification, while others were developed to respond to general priority areas, *e.g.*, Indicator 5, the percentage of children with disabilities served in different settings, developed to address the provision of FAPE in the LRE.

In December 2005, each State submitted its SPP, including targets through FFY 2010.

2011

In 2011, to meet the requirement set forth in IDEA section 616(b)(1)(C) that the State review its SPP at least once every six years, and in the absence of IDEA reauthorization, OSEP proposed to make no major changes to the SPP and to maintain the indicators as written. Therefore, with its 2011 SPP submission, each State extended its targets and improvement activities through FFY 2012.

2012

Beginning in 2012, OSEP reconceptualized its accountability system. That system, *Results Driven Accountability* (RDA), was designed to best support States in improving results for students with disabilities. Previously, OSEP's accountability system, including the SPP/APR, was heavily focused on compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements, with limited focus on how the requirements impacted results for students with disabilities. RDA balanced the focus on improved educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities, while considering compliance as it relates to those results and outcomes. The SPP/APR is a critical component of RDA.

OSEP eliminated two indicators that were not required by statute where OSEP determined that the information submitted was duplicative of data submitted by States through another OMB-approved information collection (EDFacts), thereby reducing reporting burden. OSEP continues to evaluate a State's performance on State complaint timelines and due process hearing timelines as a part of its determination process.

Also in 2012, OSEP requested and was granted permission by OMB to make several significant technical amendments to the approved SPP/APR package, which reduced reporting burden. Beginning with the FFY 2011 SPP and APR (submitted in February 2013), States:

- were not required to report on progress and must only report on slippage for a particular indicator if the State does not meet its target for that indicator;
- could have one set of improvement activities that covered all indicators instead of reporting improvement activities under each indicator;
- were required to only report on improvement activities for indicators where it did not meet its target; and

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
REVISED August 2020

- were not required to provide data for Indicator 20 with its initial submission.

2014

Revisions in 2014 to the SPP/APR information collection for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 were based on the following principles:

- alignment with the RDA vision and its goals,
- reducing reporting burden by requiring only what is necessary in the statute and regulations or vital to ensuring improved educational results and functional outcomes; and
- retaining consistent data sources and measurements as much as possible.

The following revisions to the SPP/APR information collection, which were approved in 2012 and 2014, were incorporated into the FFY 2013-FFY 2018 SPP/APR:

1. Combine the SPP and APR into one document.
2. Collect SPP/APR through an online submission system (GRADS 360) that includes the capability to respond to the SPP/APR electronically.
3. Report on slippage only if the State does not meet its target for the reporting year.
4. Develop streamlined and coordinated systems descriptions.
5. Required submission of a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The SSIP is a comprehensive, ambitious yet achievable plan that is focused on improved outcomes for children with disabilities.
6. Eliminated reporting on the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system, and on the timeliness and accuracy of its State-reported data (previous Indicators 15 and 20. While the indicators were removed, the requirement to report under each compliance indicator on the correction of State-identified noncompliance remains. Additionally, OSEP continues to calculate each State's compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate IDEA section 618 data and SPP/APR data.

2017

Revisions were made to provide State's with flexibility in reporting, to improve data quality, and to align with changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These revisions included:

- revising Indicator 1 (Graduation) to allow States the flexibility of reporting data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one;
- aligning Indicator 3 (assessments) with the requirements in ESEA;
- requiring in Indicator 4 (suspension/expulsion) that States only report on districts that meet the minimum "n" size to provide a more accurate reflection of the rates of significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion;
- revising Indicator 7 (preschool outcomes) to be aligned with previously released guidance that explicitly required that only children who received special education and

related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years be included in the measurement;

- aligning Indicator 9 and 10 (disproportionate representation) with the requirements in final significant disproportionality regulations, which were published in the Federal Register (81 FR 92376) on December 19, 2016 and became effective on January 18, 2017 (See 34 CFR §300.647(a)(3) and (4));
- revising Indicator 12 (Part C to B transition at age 3) to add a category for the number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option, which would then be subtracted from the denominator;
- clarifying Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) to allow the State to choose to include youth beginning at a younger age in its data for this indicator if a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet the requirements for secondary transition at an age younger than 16;
- requiring States, in cases where the State reported less than 100% compliance on a compliance indicator(s) in the previous reporting year, to explain why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance during the previous reporting period even though data indicated less than 100% compliance;
- revising the instructions for Indicators 8 (parent involvement) and 14 (post-school outcomes) to encourage States, where the State has not addressed representativeness or has reported that the response data were not representative, to provide more detail on the effectiveness of the State's efforts to collect more representative data, and to move up the timeline for reporting on representativeness; and
- providing more clarity on SSIP reporting.