

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 2023 SPP/APR to be submitted in February 2025. The explanation is accompanied by two appendices. Appendix A sets 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 PART B SPP/APR

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is proposing revisions to the current Part B SPP/APR under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), which includes OSEP, 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. A key responsibility of OSEP is to ensure States' compliance with the IDEA as well as ensuring that States improve results and outcomes for children with disabilities.

In 2022, OSEP hosted five listening sessions and received more than 100 comments from States, families, and other stakeholders regarding how OSEP could prioritize equity and effectively monitor and support States on their implementation of Parts B and C of the IDEA. The proposed revisions to the SPP/APR are responsive to this stakeholder input, ensure State educational agencies (SEAs) are responsible for the oversight of special education services, and examine inequities in the implementation of IDEA and focus on results for historically marginalized populations.

General Supervision: Indicator 18

OSEP is proposing to add Indicator 18 on general supervision. A number of factors contributed to this need for focus on State general supervision systems in the IDEA Part B SPP/APR. Specifically, throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, OSEP heard from stakeholders about barriers to accessing special education services. During the COVID-19 pandemic, some children went without necessary services and the rates of both referrals to IDEA and evaluation under IDEA decreased. The data collected by OSEP under Sections 616 and 618 of the IDEA during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 reporting years were significantly impacted by the COVID-19 disruptions. Additionally, in recent years, through its monitoring activities, OSEP has learned that virtually all monitored States have not been monitoring LEA activities outside of the SPP/APR compliance indicators. Monitoring for IDEA requirements beyond the SPP/APR compliance indicators is critical for SEAs as part of the State's general supervision responsibilities under IDEA section 612(a)(11) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.149. Without monitoring, SEAs do not know whether and how children and youth with disabilities and their families are receiving needed IDEA Part B services. In addition, in key results areas such as FAPE in the LRE, child find, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, transition services, and disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education, effective monitoring for related requirements helps the SEA examine potential causes for poor performance on outcomes. Thus, it is critical for SEAs to comprehensively monitor LEAs and identify and correct noncompliance consistent with IDEA

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2023

requirements. Now, as LEAs and families continue to recover from the pandemic and OSEP is focusing on improving results and the development and learning for all children with disabilities, it is essential to ensure that SEAs are fully aware of and acting on their general supervision obligations under IDEA sections 612(a)(11) and 616(a)(3)(B) and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149 and 600(d)(2).

Thus, OSEP is phasing in the general supervision indicator to require reporting on the identification and correction of all findings of noncompliance as part of the State’s general supervision responsibilities, which includes findings made through fiscal monitoring, Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements, and other areas of monitoring by the State. Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR (submitted in February 2025), States will be required to report on the identification and correction of all noncompliance related to the SPP/APR compliance indicators. Ultimately, this indicator will be broadened in the next SPP/APR cycle for FFY 2026 through FFY 2031 to also require reporting on the identification and correction of all noncompliance related to the State’s general supervision responsibilities. This would include fiscal monitoring, related requirements for results indicators, and other areas of monitoring by the State.

Suspension/Expulsion: Indicators 4A and 4B

Additionally, OSEP has voiced significant concern regarding disparities in the use of discipline for children with disabilities, particularly children with disabilities of color, as noted in OSEP’s Dear Colleague Letter on the Implementation of IDEA Discipline Provisions and in the accompanying guidance entitled Questions and Answers: Addressing the Needs of Children with Disabilities and IDEA’s Discipline Provisions (both released July 2022). As OSEP stated in this guidance, States must select a methodology that is reasonably designed to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities, including by race and ethnicity, among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. Thus, OSEP is proposing States report on elements of their existing methodology that are necessary for OSEP to analyze and determine the reasonableness of such methodology for identifying significant discrepancies in LEAs.

The proposed revisions are as follows:

Current Indicator: Number and Topic / Scope of Change	Proposed Indicator Number	Proposed Revisions
1: Graduation		No change
2: Drop Out		No change
3A: Assessment Participation rates for		No change

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2023

children with IEPs.		
3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.		No change
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.		No change
3D: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.		No change
4A: Suspension / Expulsion All children with IEPs 4B: Suspension / Expulsion Race/Ethnicity		<p>OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for Indicators 4A and 4B to require States to provide: (1) the definition of its minimum n and/or cell size and the rationale for its chosen methodology (if the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement); (2) the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate (if the State uses this rate to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State); and (3) the State’s rate difference or rate ratio (if the State uses either one to compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs).</p> <p>While some States provide sufficient information in each of these areas, many States’ SPP/APR submissions lack the critical details for OSEP to analyze and determine the reasonableness of the State’s methodology. Many States do not provide OSEP with a</p>

	<p>definition of the minimum n and/or cell size they use in determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, which is information necessary for OSEP to determine the reasonableness of the State’s methodology for including and excluding LEAs in its examination for significant discrepancy. In addition, many of the States that opt to compare an LEA’s long-term suspension and expulsion rate to the State-level rate do not provide OSEP the State-level rate used in determining significant discrepancy. Similarly, for those States that opt to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates for nondisabled children within an LEA, some do not provide OSEP the State-selected rate difference used in determining whether an LEA has significant discrepancy. These data elements are necessary for OSEP to determine the reasonableness of the State’s methodology for identifying significant discrepancy in its LEAs. As OSEP stated in Questions and Answers: Addressing the Needs of Children with Disabilities and IDEA’s Discipline Provisions (released July 2022) and reiterated in the General Instructions for the FFY 2021 IDEA Part B SPP/APR (which States were required to submit by February 1, 2023), a State’s chosen methodology for this indicator must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. OSEP also stated that factors it may consider in determining reasonableness of a State’s methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy.</p> <p><u>Definition of minimum n and/or cell size:</u> Under this proposed change, if a State has established a minimum n and/or cell size, the State would be required to provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size – i.e., the value of the minimum n and/or cell size (for example, an n size of 15, and a cell size of 5), as well as a description of what the value represents (for example, an n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who received out-of-school suspensions or expulsions of more than 10 days</p>
--	---

	<p>within the LEA).</p> <p><u>State-level long-term suspension/expulsion rate:</u> Under this proposed change, if a State has chosen to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State, the State would be required to provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in the comparison. In other words, if a State determines an LEA to have a significant discrepancy where the LEA’s rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rate exceeds a certain threshold above the State-level long-term suspension/expulsion rate (for example, 2 percentage points above the State-level rate), the State would be required to provide not just the threshold it uses but also the State-level long-term suspension/expulsion rate itself (for example, the State-level rate is 0.7%).</p> <p><u>State-selected rate difference or rate ratio:</u> Under this proposed change, if a State has chosen to compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, and the State uses a State-selected rate difference to make this comparison, the State would be required to provide OSEP the State-selected rate difference. In other words, if a State determines an LEA to have a significant discrepancy where the LEA’s rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs exceeds a certain rate as compared to nondisabled children, the State would be required to provide the State-chosen rate difference itself. For example, if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points. Similarly, if the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP</p>
--	---

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2023

		<p>with the rate ratio of 3.0).</p> <p>These proposed changes would enable OSEP to conduct a consistent, thorough, and accurate review of SPP/APR Indicators 4A and 4B submissions across all States. Requiring States to provide this information would also enable OSEP and stakeholders to more fully understand the impact of a State’s methodology on the State’s ability to identify significant discrepancies within its LEAs.</p> <p>States already possess the information that each proposed change would require, because States use such information to fulfill their obligations for reporting under current SPP/APR Indicators 4A and 4B. Therefore, OSEP believes these proposed changes would not pose an additional data collection burden on States.</p> <p>None of these proposed changes would require a State to change its baseline data or targets.</p>
5: LRE		No Change
6: Preschool LRE		No Change
9: Disproportionate Representation		No Change
10: Disproportionate Representation Race/Ethnicity		No Change

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
 REVISED August 2023

11: Timely Evaluations		No Change
12: C to B Transition		No Change
13: Secondary Transition		No Change
14: Post-school Outcomes		No Change
15: Resolution		No Change
16: Mediation		No Change
17: SSIP		No Change
New Indicator: General Supervision	18	<p>OSEP proposes to reestablish the general supervision indicator as a separate reporting requirement. This indicator measures the effectiveness of the State educational agency’s systems of general supervision in ensuring the identification of noncompliance and correction of noncompliance in a timely manner. States were previously required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2005 through FFY 2012 SPP/APR submissions. This indicator was removed for the FFY 2013 SPP/APR and subsequent submissions because OSEP expected that State-reported data on the correction of prior year findings of noncompliance under compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 would be sufficient to evaluate a State’s system of general supervision. OSEP has learned through its recent monitoring and other oversight activities that limiting State-reported data in this manner does not provide sufficient information to the public or to OSEP about the nature and extent of a State’s compliance with IDEA requirements in the State nor the effectiveness of the State’s system of general supervision and monitoring to ensure timely correction of identified noncompliance. Reinstating the general supervision indicator provides greater transparency regarding a State’s monitoring and dispute resolution procedures used to identify noncompliance and the extent to which a State ensures the timely correction of any identified findings of noncompliance.</p>

		<p>In connection with this indicator, OSEP proposes to reinstate the Related Requirements document that was previously approved in 2017. This document includes a list of each of the Monitoring Priorities and Indicators in the SPP/APR and the requirements from the statutes and regulations that are related to each Priority and Indicator. The purpose of this document is multifaceted. First, it informs States of the statutory and/or regulatory requirements related to each Indicator that will be reviewed by OSEP as part of monitoring. That is, States should review the Related Requirements document and ensure the components in their general supervision systems are adequate to ensure that the IDEA requirements are being met. Second, this document serves as a guide that States can use to determine how to appropriately report on areas of noncompliance it has identified that relate to, but are not specifically associated with, the requirements of the indicator. OSEP encourages States to examine the components within their general supervision systems to ensure they appropriately address these Related Requirements.</p>
--	--	--

Appendix A: Legal Requirements

SPP/APR: Section 616(b)(1)(A) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA or Act) requires that, 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 SPP, 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 –
 - Child find
 - Effective monitoring
 - The use of resolution sessions and mediation; and
 - 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 IDEA section 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 that reflect improvement over the State’s baseline for results indicators and 100% compliance for compliance indicators. 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:

States must include in their APRs brief information on the reasons for slippage (an explanation of slippage in indicators where the State did not meet its target). 2 C.F.R. §200.329(c)(2)(ii) (replacing 34 C.F.R. § 80.40(b)(2)).

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

Appendix B: Prior Significant Milestones or Revisions

2005

The IDEA Part B SPP/APR package (Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number 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 for FFY 2005 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 FFY 2011 SPP submission, each State extended its original SPP targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.

2012

Beginning in 2012, the Department reconceptualized its accountability system. That system, *Results Driven Accountability* (RDA), was designed to best support States in improving results for children with disabilities. Previously, the Department'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 outcomes and results for children with disabilities. RDA balanced the focus on improved educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, while considering compliance as it relates to those results and outcomes. The SPP/APR is a critical component of RDA.

In 2012, OSEP eliminated two indicators in the SPP/APR 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. Additionally, these indicators were not required by the statute, and, because the data are available to the Department through the other data collections, the Department could continue to use the data to evaluate a State's performance as part of the Department's determination process. As a result, States were no longer required to report in the SPP/APR on Indicators 16 (State Complaint Timelines) and 17 (Due Process Hearing Timelines).

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;

Proposed Revisions to FFY 2020 – FFY 2025 Part B SPP/APR: Explanation and Rationale
REVISED November 2022

- were required to only report on improvement activities for indicators where it did not meet its target; and
- were not required to provide data for Indicator 20 with its initial submission.

With its FFY 2013 APR, each State submitted its second SPP, including targets for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018.

2014

OSEP made revisions in 2014 to the SPP/APR information collection for FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 based on the following principles:

- alignment with the RDA vision and its goals,
- reducing reporting burden by requiring primarily what is required by 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. With the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, States were no longer required to report on Improvement Activities for each indicator. Rather, States were required to submit a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) through a new qualitative Indicator 17. The SSIP is a comprehensive, ambitious yet achievable plan that is focused on improved outcomes for children with disabilities. While the primary focus of the SSIP is on improvement of outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, the State must also address in its SSIP how the State will use information from its general supervision systems to identify areas that need improvement.
6. Eliminated prior Indicators 15 (General Supervision) and 20 (Data). Prior Indicator 15 required a State to report on the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system by reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance identified in the prior fiscal year and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification in the reporting fiscal year for the APR. The requirement to report under each compliance indicator on the correction of State-identified noncompliance remained.

Prior Indicator 20 required a State to provide data on the timeliness and accuracy of its data reported to OSEP under IDEA sections 616 and 618. Instead, OSEP now calculates each State's compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate IDEA section 618 data and SPP/APR data under IDEA section 616.

2017

OSEP made revisions to provide States with flexibility in reporting, to improve data quality, and to align with changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). These revisions included:

- revising the measurement for 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;
- revising the measurement and instructions for Indicator 4 (Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Suspensions/Expulsions) that States only report on districts that meet the minimum “n” size (if the State has established one) to provide a more accurate reflection of the percentage of LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion;
- revising the instructions for Indicator 7 (Preschool Outcomes) to align 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;
- revising the measurement and instructions for Indicators 9 and 10 (Disproportionate Representation) to require States to provide certain details in their definitions of “disproportionate representation,” including any minimum “n” and/or cell sizes consistent with the terminology used in the 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 C.F.R. §300.647(a)(3) and (4)), to enable the Department and the public to have a more complete understanding of how States define “disproportionate representation”; and requiring in Indicators 9 and 10 that States only report on districts that meet the minimum “n” and/or cell size (if the State has established one) for one or more racial/ethnic group(s), to provide a more accurate reflection of the percentage of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification;
- revising the measurement for 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 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar State option, which would then be subtracted from the denominator, to ensure that the measurement more accurately represents the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 and who are found eligible for Part B, who are required to have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays;
- revising the measurement for Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) to clarify that, if a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet the requirements for secondary transition at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator, so that States choosing to hold themselves accountable for meeting the secondary transition

requirement for children younger than age 16 are permitted to report in alignment with the State’s policies and procedures;

- revising the instructions for Indicators 4B (Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rate of Suspensions and Expulsions), 9, 10, 11 (Timely Initial Evaluations), 12, and 13 to require 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
- revising the instructions for Indicator 17 (SSIP) to provide more clarity on SSIP reporting.

2020

OSEP made revisions in 2020 to the SPP/APR information collection for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 based on the following principles:

- elevating parent voice in special education and related services provided under IDEA;
- ensuring that each State is receiving quality, actionable information from the most and varied parent voices as possible to help States evaluate the effectiveness of their systems;
- maintaining consistent reporting instructions across the 60 Part B reporting entities;

These revisions included:

- revising the data source for Indicator 1 (Graduation) and Indicator 2 (Drop Out) to require States to report the same data reported to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, to allow direct focus on the outcomes of children 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;
- revising the measurement for Indicator 3 (Assessments) to focus on grades 4, 8, and high school, rather than inclusive of all grades assessed under ESEA (grades 3-8 and high school), for several reasons (including to mitigate the masking of high/low performance or improvement/no improvement if all grades are combined to generate an average, and to focus on the effectiveness of early elementary instruction and on the successful transition of students with disabilities from middle/junior high school to high school);
- revising the measurement and instructions for Indicator 4 (Suspension/Expulsion) to provide more clarity and consistency by replacing the term “district” with “LEA” to align with IDEA section 612(a)(22) and to be consistent across all aspects of the indicator; adding language to clarify that significant discrepancy is defined by the State; defining “long-term suspensions and expulsions” as “more than 10 days during the school year”

consistent with the IDEA section 618 data collection; and including “cell size” in addition to “n size” to align with Indicators 9 and 10;

- revising the indicator, measurement, and instructions for Indicator 5 (LRE) and Indicator 6 (Preschool LRE) to align with changes to the EdFacts file specifications, by requiring States to include five-year-old children with disabilities enrolled in kindergarten under Indicator 5 and to include five-year-old children with disabilities enrolled in preschool programs under Indicator 6;
- revising the indicator, measurement, and instructions for Indicator 6 to require States to report on preschool children with disabilities who receive special education and related services in the home to align with EdFacts file specifications and provide transparency; and to provide States the option to disaggregate reporting by discrete age (3, 4, and 5) to facilitate States’ analysis of trends in placements of preschool children with disabilities;
- revising the instructions for Indicator 8 (Parent Involvement) and Indicator 14 (Post-School Outcomes) to require States to include race/ethnicity in the analysis of representativeness in addition to one other category, analyze response rates and describe strategies to increase response rates, and describe the metric for representativeness;
- revising the indicator and measurement for Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) to clarify the types of participating agencies that should be included in IEP Team meetings if the purpose of the meeting is consideration of postsecondary goals and transition services;
- revising the instructions for Indicator 14 (Post-School Outcomes) to provide continued flexibility on the definition used for competitive employment, and to require States to provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census;
- aligning the due date of the SSIP with the other indicators in the SPP/APR submission.