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 2026 SPP/APR to be submitted in February 2028. 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 FFY2026 - FFY2031 PART B SPP/APR

The Office of Special Education Programs (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 FFY 2026 through FFY 2031. 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

OSEP acknowledges that States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and parents know best the needs of their children, and the systems and structures used to support them. Therefore, OSEP held listening sessions at the 2025 OSEP Conference on the current SPP/APR and suggestions for improvement. The proposed revisions to the SPP/APR are responsive to stakeholder input and reduce burden for States by more closely aligning the SPP/APR to statutory requirements, eliminating duplicative reporting, and further streamlining reporting requirements in the online reporting tool while maintaining strong accountability. Changes proposed to the present Information Collection Request are aimed at more closely aligning Federal monitoring mechanisms (such as the SPP/APR) to IDEA's statutory requirements and increasing transparency. The proposed changes also reflect priorities to collect and disseminate meaningful data, improve outcomes, and increase parent choice.

Additionally, in order to obtain input from data submitters and stakeholders regarding Indicator 5 (Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)) and Indicator 8 (Parent Involvement) OSEP has included directed questions via the attachment. While many of these questions are directed to State educational agency (SEA) data submitters, comments from all stakeholders on these topics are encouraged.

The proposed revisions are as follows:

Current Indicator: Number and Topic / Scope of Change	Proposed Indicator Number	Proposed Revisions
1: Graduation		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions to clarify that States must report whether its State law, rule, and/or policy permits youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) to graduate with a regular high school diploma by meeting requirements that differ from the requirements applicable to youth without IEPs. If such policies exist, the State must describe: (1) the State law, rule and/or policy that permits a youth with a disability to receive a regular high school diploma without satisfying all the requirements that youth without disabilities must satisfy to obtain a regular high school diploma; (2) how the State is monitoring to ensure that LEAs are collecting and reporting IDEA section 618 data to the State that is consistent with the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009; and, (3) how the State is monitoring to ensure that parents and youth with disabilities are informed that the receipt of the diploma identified above does not end the LEA's obligation to provide FAPE to the youth, and that the youth is still eligible to receive FAPE until the youth graduates with a regular high school diploma (as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv)) or the youth exceeds the age eligibility of FAPE under State law.
2: Drop Out		No change
3A: Assessment Participation rates for children with IEPs.		No change
3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement		No change

standards.		
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		OSEP proposes to eliminate this indicator. Section 616(b) of the IDEA requires that each State have in place a performance plan that evaluates the State's efforts to implement and improve implementation of IDEA under three priorities:(a) the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the LRE; (b) State exercise of general supervision authority; and (c) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification. Within the statutory requirements for State performance plans, IDEA does not require States to report data related to significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with IEPs in the SPP/APR. IDEA does require States to examine data to determine if significant discrepancies exist and report discipline data to the Department. Specifically, Each State is required to provide an assurance to the Department that it examines data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity, 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 such rates for nondisabled children within such agencies. This assurance is provided annually during the State's application for the IDEA Part B grant award (Section 612(a)(22)). OSEP monitors to ensure States are meeting these requirements. Additionally, there is a wealth of discipline data related to students with disabilities submitted to the

		Department. Under Section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to submit data to the Department on children with disabilities ages 3 through 21 who are suspended or expelled for disciplinary reasons. Additionally, all public schools and districts receiving financial assistance from the Department are required to submit discipline data on students with disabilities as part of the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). CRDC includes data on the use of corporal punishment; one or more in-school suspension; one out-of-school suspension; more than one out-of-school suspension; an expulsion with educational services; an expulsion without educational services; an expulsion under zero-tolerance policies; or transfer to alternative school for disciplinary reasons, CRDC data is disaggregated by students with an IEP, students with disabilities on a 504 plan and disaggregated by race and sex. All data reported to the Department under section 618 of IDEA and the CRDC are publicly available. Therefore, to reduce reporting burden, and better align the SPP/APR reporting requirements to the statutory and regulatory requirements, OSEP proposes eliminating Indicator 4A. This change does not eliminate any protections under IDEA or statutory or regulatory requirements, including those in IDEA section 612(a)(22) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.170, or the data collection and reporting requirements under IDEA section 618 or the CRDC.
4B: Suspension / Expulsion Race/Ethnicity		OSEP proposes to eliminate this indicator. Section 616(b) of the IDEA requires that each State have in place a performance plan that evaluates the State's efforts to implement and improve implementation of IDEA under three priorities:(a) the provision of a free FAPE in the LRE; (b) State exercise of general supervision authority; and (c) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification. IDEA does not require States to report data related to significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with IEPs in the SPP/APR. IDEA does require States to examine data to determine if significant discrepancies exist and report discipline data to the Department. Specifically, Each State is required to provide an assurance to the Department that it examines data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity, 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 such rates for nondisabled children within such agencies. This assurance is provided annually during the State's application for the IDEA Part B grant award (Section 612(a)(22)). OSEP monitors to ensure States are meeting these requirements. Additionally, there is a wealth of discipline data related to students with disabilities submitted to the Department. Under Section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to submit data to the Department on children with disabilities ages 3 through 21 who are suspended or expelled for disciplinary reasons. Additionally, all public schools and districts receiving financial assistance from the Department are required to submit discipline data on students with disabilities as part of the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). CRDC includes data on the use of corporal punishment; one or more in-school suspension; one out-of-school suspension; more than one out-of-school suspension; an expulsion with educational services; an expulsion without educational services; an expulsion under zero-tolerance policies; or transfer to alternative school for disciplinary reasons, CRDC data is disaggregated by students with an IEP, students with disabilities on a 504 plan and disaggregated by race and sex. All data reported to the Department under section 618 of IDEA and the CRDC are publicly available. Therefore, to reduce reporting burden, and better align the SPP/APR reporting requirements to the statutory and regulatory requirements, OSEP proposes eliminating Indicator 4B. This change does not eliminate any protections under IDEA or any statutory or regulatory requirements, including those in IDEA section 612(a)(22) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.170, or the data collection and reporting requirements under IDEA section 618 or the CRDC.
5: LRE		No change
6: Preschool LRE		No change
7: Preschool Outcomes		OSEP proposes revising Outcome A to align with Outcomes B and C so that all three areas consistently emphasize learning and development. Social and emotional development in early childhood is essential for school readiness and long-term success, as positive early behaviors support stronger outcomes throughout life. The revised outcome indicators are

		designed to reflect children's learning trajectories from infancy through preschool, highlighting continuous growth and development across time.
8: Parent Involvement		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. In order to facilitate greater transparency and drive system improvement, OSEP believes that States must provide information about data collection and report how parental involvement data are being used to improve services and outcomes for children with disabilities. OSEP proposes to revise the instructions to require States to: (1) describe how the data are collected; (2) provide a link to the survey, if a survey is used to collect the data for this indicator; and (3) describe how parental involvement data are utilized to improve services and outcomes for children with disabilities. Further, to reduce burden and provide States with greater flexibility in analyzing their data, OSEP removed the requirement that States must include an analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Most States currently report that their Indicator B8 data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Thus, OSEP is shifting the focus of the States' analysis from representativeness of the response data, to how the data are used to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities.
9: Disproportionate Representation		OSEP proposes to revise the measurement and instructions for Indicator 9. Section 616(a) of the IDEA requires the Department to monitor State implementation of IDEA through multiple mechanisms including oversight of its general supervision responsibilities (see IDEA section 612(a)(11)) and through the SPP/APR. As required by the IDEA, the SPP/APR uses quantifiable indicators in priority areas, including disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification. Currently, under Indicator 9, States are required to report data that do not factor into the measurement of the percent of districts

		with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Therefore, OSEP proposes to remove the requirements that: (1) States include the definition of "disproportionate representation"; and, (2) provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. OSEP believes that reporting this information is burdensome and unnecessary because it does not contribute to the validity and reliability of the data and is not statutorily required by the IDEA. States will still be required to report the number of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator to remove the requirement that States provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance. Under this proposed change, States would no longer be required to: (1) provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance; (2) report on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification); or, (3) provide an explanation regarding why the State did not issue any written findings of noncompliance (if the State reported less than 100% compliance (or for this indicator greater than 0% compliance) for the previous reporting period) including how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. States already report detailed information about the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18. Therefore, reporting under this indicator is unnecessary. To reduce burden and eliminate States being required to report duplicative information, OSEP is proposing to revise the instructions under each compliance indicator to remove the requirement to report on the correction of noncompliance and only require States to report on the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18.
10: Disproportionate Representation Race/Ethnicity		OSEP proposes to eliminate this indicator. Section 616(a) of the IDEA requires the Department to monitor State implementation of IDEA through multiple mechanisms including oversight of its general supervision responsibilities (see IDEA section 612(a)(11)) and through the SPP/APR. As required by IDEA, the SPP/APR uses quantifiable

		indicators in priority areas, including: a) the provision of FAPE in the LRE; b) State exercise of general supervision authority; and c) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification. Within the statutory requirements for State performance plans, IDEA does not require States to report data related to disproportionate representation of racial ethnic groups, in specific disability categories, that is the result of inappropriate identification in the SPP/APR. OSEP has determined that including Indicator 10 as a quantifiable indicator in the SPP/APR exceeds IDEA's statutory authority, and Indicator 9, is sufficient to meet IDEA's statutory requirement for this priority area. Therefore, to better align the SPP/APR reporting requirements to the statutory and regulatory requirements, and to reduce the reporting burden for States, OSEP proposes to eliminate Indicator 10.
11: Timely Evaluations		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator to remove the requirement that States provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance. Under this proposed change, States would no longer be required to: (1) provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance; (2) report on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification); or, (3) provide an explanation regarding why the State did not issue any written findings of noncompliance (if the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period) including how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. States already report detailed information about the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18. Therefore, reporting under this Indicator is unnecessary. To reduce burden and eliminate States being required to report duplicative information, OSEP is proposing to revise the instructions under each compliance indicator to remove the requirement to report on the correction of noncompliance and only require States to report on the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18.

12: C to B Transition		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator to remove the requirement that States provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance. Under this proposed change, States would no longer be required to: (1) provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance; (2) report on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification); or, (3) provide an explanation regarding why the State did not issue any written findings of noncompliance (if the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period) including how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. States already report detailed information about the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18. Therefore, reporting under this Indicator is unnecessary. To reduce burden and eliminate States being required to report duplicative information, OSEP is proposing to revise the instructions under each compliance indicator to remove the requirement to report on the correction of noncompliance and only require States to report on the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18.
13: Secondary Transition		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator to remove the requirement that States provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance. Under this proposed change, States would no longer be required to: (1) provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance; (2) report on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification); or, (3) provide an explanation regarding why the State did not issue any written findings of noncompliance (if the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period) including how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. States already report detailed information about the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18. Therefore, reporting under this Indicator is unnecessary. To reduce burden and eliminate States being required to report duplicative information, OSEP is proposing to revise the instructions under each compliance indicator to remove the requirement to report on the correction of noncompliance and only require States to report on the correction of

		noncompliance under Indicator 18.
14: Post-school Outcomes		To reduce burden and provide States with greater flexibility in analyzing their data, OSEP proposes to remove the requirement that States must include an analysis of the extent to which the response data 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. Most States currently report that their Indicator B14 data 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. Thus, OSEP is shifting the focus of the States' analysis from representativeness of the response data, to how the data are used to improve educational results and functional outcomes for all youth with disabilities.
15: Resolution		No change
16: Mediation		No change
17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator to remove references to reporting requirements that were applicable in the initial phases of the SSIP but are no longer applicable because States have been in various stages of implementation for approximately ten years. Stakeholders may refer to prior year Measurement Tables for historical information. Additionally, OSEP is proposing revisions to the instructions for clarity related to stakeholder engagement, implementation of evidence-based practices, and measures of fidelity. OSEP also proposes to streamline the reporting requirements in the online reporting platform to reduce reporting burden for States by removing 11 of the 32 (34%) qualitative data fields in this Indicator that are no longer relevant or are redundant.
18: General Supervision		OSEP proposes to revise the instructions for this indicator for clarity regarding where States report on the correction of noncompliance prior to the issuance of written notification of noncompliance. Specifically, if a State reports less than 100% compliance for any compliance indicator for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2026 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2025), but did not identify any findings of noncompliance, the State is required to provide, in this indicator, an explanation of why the State did not issue any written findings of noncompliance and include how the State verified, prior to issuing

		a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Prior to this revision, States meeting this condition were required to report this information under each applicable compliance indicator. To eliminate duplication and reduce burden, OSEP has revised the instructions for this indicator to require States to report on the correction of noncompliance only in this indicator and as noted earlier, has removed the requirement to report this information under the other compliance indicators (Indicators 9, 11, 12, and 13).

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 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 CFR § 200.329(c)(2)(ii) (replacing 34 CFR § 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.*, Indicator 9 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;

- 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:

- aligning 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 CFR §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 CFR §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; and
- 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; and
- aligning the due date of the SSIP with the other indicators in the SPP/APR submission.

<u>2023</u>

OSEP made revisions focused on ensuring SEAs are responsible for the oversight of special education services and examining inequities in the implementation of IDEA. These revisions included:

- revising the instructions for Indicators 4A (Suspension/Expulsion All Children with IEPs) and 4B (Suspension/Expulsion Race/Ethnicity) 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).
- reestablishing Indicator 18 (General Supervision) as a separate reporting requirement. This indicator measures the effectiveness of the SEA's systems of general supervision in ensuring the identification of noncompliance and correction of noncompliance in a timely manner.