

General

Comments: OSEP received one comment questioning why lag data are collected for Indicator 2. OSEP received several comments requesting that OSEP add indicators to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) related to communication and language access to support children who are deaf.

Discussion: These comments are unrelated to the proposed changes in this information collection; therefore, it is beyond the scope of the Notice and OSEP declines to respond further at this time.

Changes: None.

Comments: One commenter expressed concern that the proposed changes, while intended to reduce burden and return education to the States, may result in unintended consequences that inadvertently increase burden and negatively impact children with disabilities, including their access to a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE).

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenter raising these concerns and addresses them for each proposed change in the text of the discussions that follow.

Changes: None.

Comment: OSEP received several comments from individuals, advocacy organizations, and universities representing the deaf and hard of hearing community with regard to Indicator 5 and the requirements around least restrictive environment (LRE). The commenters expressed concern with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)'s LRE requirements and related reporting. Specifically, the commenters believe that LRE implementation emphasizes physical proximity to nondisabled peers and time spent in regular education settings and thus may incentivize placement of children who are deaf and hard of hearing in environments where access to qualified personnel, such as interpreters and teachers specialized in working with this population, are sparse. The commenters expressed concern that the collection and reporting of these data encourage placement in environments with nondisabled peers as opposed to placement in separate educational environments designed for deaf and hard of hearing children that the commenters described as language-rich with better supports related to communication access.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenters' concerns. The requirements for determining the placement of a child with a disability are included in the IDEA Part B regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 300.116. This regulation requires that placement decisions be made by a group of persons, including the parents

and other persons knowledgeable about the child, the meaning of the evaluation data, and the placement options. This decision must be made in conformity with the LRE provisions, including §§ 300.114 through 300.118. OSEP has not proposed any changes to Indicator 5 through the present information collection, but rather posed directed questions related to changing the aggregation by educational environment. Thus, OSEP concludes that it is not appropriate to make changes to address these comments at this time

Changes: None.

Indicator 1

Comment: Several commenters expressed support for revising the instructions for Indicator 1 to clarify States must report if they have a State law, rule, and/or policy that allows children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to graduate with a regular high school diploma by meeting different requirements than those applicable to children without IEPs. The commenters believe that this revision would improve transparency for families and children, more effectively inform decisions about graduation pathways, and strengthen monitoring of local practices. One commenter opposed the change and stated that the revision would lead to additional reporting burden for States with no clear value added.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenters' support of the proposed revision for this indicator. This revision will increase transparency and provide a clearer understanding of outcomes for children with disabilities and families.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters proposed the addition of a new indicator measuring the gap in the adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) for children with IEPs and all children.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the suggestion and acknowledges the importance of ensuring that accurate and complete data are available to understand outcomes for children with disabilities. OSEP does not agree that it is appropriate to expand the number of indicators included in the SPP/APR, as doing so would increase States' reporting burden and conflict with OSEP's ongoing efforts to streamline reporting requirements and maintain alignment with statutory and regulatory obligations.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters requested clarification on the use of the term "regular high school diploma," stating that the term is used in two different ways: first, as defined by 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv) and second, as defined by individual States. The commenters state that the usages are mutually exclusive. One

commenter conversely noted that based on federal definitions and EDFacts file specifications, students with IEPs who do not meet the same graduation standards and requirements would not count as attaining a regular high school diploma and questioned why States would be allowed to create rules, laws, and/or policies allowing students to obtain a regular diploma through such means.

Discussion: As stated in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, the term “regular high school diploma” means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential. A State’s definition of a regular high school diploma and the definition found at 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv) are not and should not be interpreted as mutually exclusive. Rather, the definition found at 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv) clarifies that eligibility for FAPE ends for students with disabilities who receive a regular high school

diploma. However, if a student with a disability does not receive a regular high school diploma (e.g., if the student graduates from high school with a credential other than a regular high school diploma as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), such as an alternate diploma or certificate of completion), the obligation to provide FAPE to the student could last until the student's 22nd birthday, or another date depending on State law which sets the State's upper age limit for FAPE. 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.101-300.102 and 300.201. The proposed revision would require States to describe such State laws, rules, and/or policies under Indicator 1 in the SPP/APR process. OSEP notes that credentials other than a regular high school diploma do not end the obligation to provide FAPE to children with disabilities.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the Department broaden the changes to the instructions to include informal practices that affect diploma attainment, noting instances in which children with disabilities are held to a lesser standard than their peers by informal means not documented in State law, rule, and/or policy, such as individual teachers assigning different classroom assignments and activities.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenter's concern that these practices can impact the extent to which children with IEPs may attain a regular high school diploma by meeting different standards than those without IEPs. Given these informal practices often take place within individual schools and classrooms and may not be reported to local educational agencies (LEAs) or States, OSEP declines to implement this suggestion through the SPP/APR process.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern over language access and its relationship to the graduation rate for children with disabilities, especially those who are deaf or hard of hearing. These commenters called for further disaggregation of Indicator 1 data for children who are deaf and hard of hearing to encapsulate those children who are deaf or hard of hearing, but who are served under a different primary eligibility category.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates these comments and acknowledges the unique needs of and importance of language access for children who are deaf and hard of hearing. These recommendations are outside the scope of the present information collection and any revisions to the IDEA Section 618 Part B Exiting data would need to be proposed through the EDFacts Data Collection information

collection package. OSEP collects and publicly reports the count of students with disabilities, ages 14-21, who graduated with a regular high school diploma by primary disability category, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.641(d), in the IDEA Section 618 Part B Exiting data file. As such, OSEP cannot incorporate these suggestions into this information collection.

Changes: None.

Indicators 4A and 4B

Comments: Most commenters opposed eliminating Indicators 4A and 4B and requested that OSEP retain them in the SPP/APR. The commenters believe that eliminating these indicators contradicts OSEP's monitoring priorities, would reduce transparency, and weaken accountability. The commenters expressed concern that the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) and IDEA Section 618 Discipline Data Collections are not equivalent substitutes because the commenters believe these data are not collected annually, do not have an associated monitoring or accountability mechanism, and could not be used to drive professional development or decisions around policies and procedures. A few commenters expressed concern over fragmented information across these two data collections and requested that, if Indicators 4A and 4B are eliminated, OSEP create a consolidated public access point where constituents could find the SPP/APR, IDEA Section

618 Data, the CRDC, and monitoring letters. One commenter expressed concern that LEAs would no longer be required to engage in a review of their policies, practices, and procedures after a discrepancy was identified if these indicators are removed. Conversely, a few commenters expressed support for the elimination of these indicators. These commenters stated that eliminating Indicators 4A and 4B will reduce duplicative reporting requirements and burden and further noted that States are still required to examine discipline data and policies through other statutory mechanisms outside of the SPP/APR process.

Discussion: OSEP remains committed to implementing Section 616 of the IDEA. Under Section 612(a)(1)-(25) of the IDEA, a State is eligible for IDEA Part B funds if it submits a plan that provides assurances to the Secretary that the State has in effect policies and procedures to ensure that the State meets each of the 25 conditions set forth in IDEA Section 612(a). This includes IDEA Section 612(a)(22) where States are required to examine 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. Further, if discrepancies are occurring, the State educational

agency (SEA) reviews and, if appropriate, revises (or requires the affected SEA or LEA to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply the IDEA.

OSEP proposes removing Indicator 4 for several reasons: (1) The obligations in IDEA Section 612(a)(22) are State responsibilities and are not required indicators in the SPP/APR. (2) By providing flexibility in implementing this requirement, States may identify more effective means of examining the data based on their unique contexts. (3) Removing the prescriptive approach to reporting these data in the SPP/APR allows States to customize reviews of LEA policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply the IDEA. (4) Regarding other data publicly available, IDEA Section 618 requires States to provide data annually to both the Department and the public on the incidence and duration of disciplinary actions by race, ethnicity, limited English proficiency status, gender, and disability category, of children with disabilities, including suspensions of 1 day or

more, as well as the number and percentage of children with disabilities who are removed to alternative educational settings or expelled as compared to children without disabilities who are removed to alternative educational settings or expelled.

Further, States must report on the number of children with disabilities who are subject to long-term suspensions or expulsions. With the proposed elimination of Indicators 4A and 4B, stakeholders could engage with individual States about whether to utilize the current methodology or to develop alternate methodologies to meet this statutory requirement.

Based on this engagement, should a State revise how it implements IDEA Section 612(a)(22), the State would be required to engage in public participation activities consistent with IDEA Section 612(a)(19), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(d)(b)(7) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.165. Additionally, OSEP notes that Indicator 18 of the SPP/APR addresses the State's general supervision responsibilities for monitoring LEAs on IDEA Part B requirements, and States will continue to report on the timely correction of noncompliance, including noncompliance with the requirements in IDEA Section 612(a)(22) as part of that indicator.

OSEP will continue to collect and analyze these data annually and remains committed to its monitoring activities to ensure

that States are meeting the statutory requirements under the IDEA.

OSEP will continue to explore additional strategies to enhance transparency and improve the public's ability to easily find relevant data.

Thus, overall, the Department considers the benefits of removing these indicators to outweigh the benefits of retaining them and that eliminating Indicators 4A and 4B would not reduce transparency or weaken accountability for exclusionary discipline affecting children with disabilities.

Changes: None.

Indicator 7

Comment: Several commenters expressed support for OSEP's proposed revisions to Indicator 7 to consistently emphasize learning and development.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenters' support regarding proposed changes to Indicator 7. This proposed change is primarily a technical edit to align the language in Outcome A with the statutory language in the IDEA.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters suggested adding “development and use of” to the end of the stem of Indicator 7 instead of the current wording within each sub-indicator.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the suggestion to revise the Indicator 7 language. However, adding “development and use of” to the root of the child outcomes measurement language would shift the emphasis away from the intended integrated view of how children grow, develop, learn, and thrive, and instead move the focus toward discrete domains of development. The current outcome areas are designed to gather information on children’s functional skills and behaviors across settings and situations, cutting across the traditional developmental domains and emphasizing meaningful participation and possibilities rather than deficits. For these reasons, OSEP declines to adopt this suggested change at this time.

Changes: None.

Indicator 8

Comment: Most commenters expressed concerns with eliminating the requirement for States to conduct demographic representativeness analyses under Indicator 8. The commenters stated that removing these requirements would skew results toward easier-to-reach respondents and would not adequately represent all children with disabilities. The commenters stated that eliminating these

requirements would diminish transparency and accountability and reduce the utility of the data for designing targeted improvement strategies. One commenter expressed support for removing the requirement to report on representativeness, stating that implementing the proposed changes would shift focus from data collection processes to how the data are used to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the concern regarding the importance of representative data and recognizes the important role of stakeholders. States have had the flexibility to define the metric used to determine representativeness and to choose at least one of the demographic factors to analyze in determining representativeness. This proposed change expands this flexibility to ensure States' analyses of Indicator 8 data are meaningful and actionable without imposing prescriptive guidelines for analysis. OSEP notes that this change does not preclude States from continuing to analyze the representativeness of their Indicator 8 data and sharing those data with stakeholders in ways that best serve their populations.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed support for the proposed revisions to the instructions for Indicator 8. Commenters

appreciated that the proposed changes would increase clarity around data collection methods and emphasis on data use.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenters' support for the proposed revisions to the instructions for Indicator 8 and agrees that the revisions will increase clarity around data collection methods and places greater emphasis on data use.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters noted the unique needs of the deaf and hard of hearing community as it relates to Indicator 8. The commenters emphasized that, for the deaf and hard of hearing community, parents must be informed of communication and educational environment options in order to meaningfully be involved in educational decision making. These commenters emphasized the importance of accessible and multi-modal methods of collecting survey data. The commenters supported the proposed changes to the instructions for Indicator 8 as a meaningful step toward ensuring parent involvement measured under Indicator 8 is prioritized for children who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates these comments and acknowledges the unique needs of and importance of accessible data collection tools for children and families who are deaf and hard of hearing. OSEP believes that requiring States to provide links to their measures and to report how data are collected and used to

improve services and outcomes for children with disabilities will drive system improvement to benefit all children with disabilities and their families, including those belonging to the deaf and hard of hearing community.

Changes: None.

Indicator 9

Comment: Most commenters opposed revisions to Indicator 9. The commenters stated that removing the requirements to report State definitions and the number of districts who met the established cell and N-sizes would limit the interpretability of the data collected and reduce accountability and transparency by obscuring how States measure disproportionality. One commenter noted that the data collected under Indicator 9 serve to surface concerns before significant disproportionality thresholds and sanctions are triggered, enabling targeted technical assistance to reduce reactive enforcement. Conversely, two commenters supported the proposed revisions to Indicator 9, citing reduced burden and duplicative reporting.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the concerns and remains committed to monitoring States' implementation of IDEA and ensuring its enforcement. Under Section 612(a)(1)-(25) of the IDEA, a State is eligible for IDEA Part B funds if it submits a plan that provides assurances to the Secretary that the State has in

effect policies and procedures to ensure that the State meets each of the 25 conditions set forth in IDEA Section 612(a). This includes IDEA Section 612(a)(24) which requires a State to have policies and procedures consistent with IDEA Section 618(d) designed to prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, including children with disabilities with a particular impairment. Reducing the reporting burden on States does not alleviate States from implementing IDEA Section 612(a)(24). Further, should a State revise how the State calculates Indicator 9, such as modifications to established cell and N-sizes, the State would be required to engage in public participation activities consistent with IDEA Section 612(a)(19), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(d)(b) (7) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.165. Finally, the proposed revision to Indicator 9 would not change States' ability to use data from Indicator 9 to conduct activities that may prevent a determination of significant disproportionality under IDEA Section 618(d). Rather, this proposed change would eliminate the requirement to report information that is not necessary for States to calculate and report 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.

Additionally, OSEP notes that Indicator 18 of the SPP/APR addresses the State's general supervision responsibilities for monitoring LEAs on IDEA Part B requirements, and States will continue to report on the timely correction of noncompliance, including noncompliance with the requirements in IDEA Section 612(a)(24) as part of that indicator.

Overall, the Department considers the benefits of the proposed revision to outweigh the benefits of retaining the current reporting requirements.

Changes: None.

Indicator 10

Comment: Most commenters expressed opposition to eliminating Indicator 10. The commenters stated that eliminating Indicator 10 would diminish public accountability and hinder States' general supervision because the data collected under Indicator 9 is not sufficient to identify potential disproportionality within disability categories. A few of these commenters asserted that school administrators rely on the disaggregated data from Indicator 10 to examine practices, and that eliminating it would limit the information necessary to make effective decisions. Conversely, two commenters expressed support for eliminating Indicator 10 from the IDEA Part B SPP/APR. These commenters noted that the data collected under Indicator 9 is sufficient to

satisfy statutory requirements related to the SPP/APR, and eliminating Indicator 10 would allow for more focused or intensive monitoring of remaining Indicators.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the concern and remains committed to monitoring States' implementation of IDEA and ensuring its enforcement. Under Section 612(a)(1)-(25) of the IDEA, a State is eligible for IDEA Part B funds if it submits a plan that provides assurances to the Secretary that the State has in effect policies and procedures to ensure that the State meets each of the 25 conditions set forth in IDEA Section 612(a). This includes IDEA Section 612(a)(24) which requires a State to have policies and procedures consistent with IDEA Section 618(d) designed to prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, including children with disabilities with a particular impairment.

OSEP proposes removing Indicator 10 for several reasons: (1) A plain reading of IDEA clearly shows the obligations in IDEA Section 612(a)(24) regarding disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, is a State responsibility and is not a required indicator in the SPP/APR.¹

¹ The Department has previously interpreted IDEA and stated that the data collected in Indicator 10 is a statutory requirement in the SPP/APR. See for example the comments associated with the revisions to IDEA significant

(2) By providing flexibility in implementing this requirement, States may identify more effective means of examining the data based on their unique contexts. (3) By removing the construct for reporting these data in the SPP/APR, States may customize reviews to determine whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification. (4) Indicator 18 of the SPP/APR addresses the State's general supervision responsibilities for monitoring LEAs on IDEA Part B requirements, and States will continue to report on the timely correction of noncompliance, including noncompliance with the requirements in IDEA Section 612(a)(24) as part of that indicator.

With the proposed elimination of Indicator 10, stakeholders could engage with individual States about whether to utilize the current methodology or to develop alternate methodologies to

disproportionality regulation in 81 FR 92390-92391 (Dec. 19, 2016). A plain language interpretation of IDEA necessitates this change. Specifically, the authority to develop the SPP/APR in IDEA Section 616(b) requires each State shall establish measurable and rigorous targets for the indicators established under the priority areas described in IDEA Section 616(a)(3). IDEA Section 616(a)(3)(C) states the monitoring priority is for "disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification," and not for the requirements in IDEA Section 612(a)(24) as it relates to disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Further, the Department has considered stakeholder reliance on the data reported in Indicator 10 and believes other data sources are sufficient to inform decision making. Therefore, the Department is changing its position as it relates to statutory requirement to include current Indicator 10 in the SPP/APR. The policy reason supporting this change are included in the discussion.

meet this statutory requirement. Based on this engagement, should a State revise how it implements IDEA Section 612(a)(24), the State would be required to engage in public participation activities consistent with IDEA Section 612(a)(19), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(d)(b)(7) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.165.

Thus, overall, the Department considers the benefits of removing this indicator to outweigh the benefits of retaining it and that eliminating Indicator 10 would not diminish accountability for the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children with particular impairments.

Changes: None.

Indicator 14

Comments: Most commenters expressed concerns with eliminating the requirement for States to conduct demographic representativeness analyses under Indicator 14. The commenters stated that removing these requirements would skew results toward easier-to-reach respondents and obscure disparities affecting underserved populations. The commenters stated that eliminating these requirements would diminish transparency and accountability and reduce the utility of the data for designing targeted improvement strategies. One commenter expressed support for the proposed changes, stating that implementing the proposed

changes would shift focus from data collection processes to how the data are used to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Discussion: States have had the flexibility to define the metric used to determine representativeness and to choose at least one the demographic factors to analyze in determining representativeness. This proposed change expands this flexibility to ensure States' analyses of Indicator 14 data are meaningful and actionable without imposing prescriptive guidelines for analysis. OSEP notes that this change does not preclude States from continuing to analyze the representativeness of their Indicator 14 data and sharing those data with stakeholders in ways that best serve their populations.

Changes: None.

Indicator 17

Comment: Several commenters supported the proposed revisions to Indicator 17. The commenters believed removing outdated and redundant elements of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) would clarify expectations for stakeholder engagement, implementation of evidence-based practices, and measures of fidelity, while maintaining transparency and accountability. The commenters appreciated the reduction in reporting burden

associated with Indicator 17 and stated that streamlining would allow States to focus on meaningful opportunities for continuous improvement.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the commenters' support for the proposed changes to Indicator 17 and agrees these revisions will reduce State burden.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters requested clarification on which qualitative fields will be removed.

Discussion: OSEP proposes removing narrative reporting elements in the online reporting platform that are no longer relevant or do not change considerably from year to year. Examples of these reporting elements include the impact of COVID-19 on States' data collection, and several qualitative fields related to data quality and the rationale and desired outcomes for specific infrastructure improvement strategies or evidence-based practices. The proposed changes will reduce the time and effort needed to complete Indicator 17 reporting.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter noted that Indicator 17 does not have an explicit statutory citation in IDEA and requested publication of the analytical framework used to determine which indicators OSEP

proposed to retain and which to eliminate to ensure consistency and transparency.

Discussion: OSEP appreciates the comment and notes that IDEA Section 616(a)(1) states that the Secretary shall monitor implementation of IDEA through: (i) oversight of the exercise of general supervision by the States, as required in IDEA section 612(a)(11) and (ii) the State performance plans, described in IDEA Section 616(b). IDEA Section 616(a)(2)(A) states that the primary focus of Federal and State monitoring activities shall be on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities. OSEP has utilized this statutory authority to develop the SSIP. Consistent with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OSEP is utilizing the information collection process to obtain public comment on proposed changes to the SPP/APR.

Changes: None

Comment: One commenter expressed concern over removing SSIP reporting fields unless early-phase SSIP requirements had been demonstrably met.

Discussion:

Phase I, the analysis of existing data was submitted by States to OSEP on April 1, 2015, and the development of the SSIP was

due the following April. At this point, States have been in Phase III, the implementation phase of the SSIP for multiple years. OSEP believes that outdated information from Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP do not need to be reported under Indicator 17.

Changes: None

Indicators 9, 11, 12, 13 (Compliance Indicators) and 18

Comments: Several commenters opposed proposed revisions to the instructions for each of the compliance indicators to remove the requirement that States provide detailed information about the correction of noncompliance within each indicator. The commenters stated that this revision would obscure the link between findings and the specific compliance indicators where issues have been identified and reduce transparency and traceability for stakeholders. The commenters expressed concern that readers would need to toggle between sections to understand whether identified noncompliance was corrected. A few commenters suggested OSEP require the reporting of the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18 to identify its originating indicator and be organized for public accessibility on a single webpage. Conversely, several commenters expressed support for this revision to reduce duplicative reporting requirements and burden.

Discussion: States were required to report on the correction of noncompliance under Indicator 18 starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, submitted February 2025. Since that submission, the compliance data reported to OSEP under Indicator 18 have been disaggregated by individual compliance indicator which allows stakeholders to see the underlying noncompliance as it relates to each compliance indicator, as well as the actions taken to correct the noncompliance. This proposed change would not weaken accountability and, in fact, increases transparency by consolidating all information related to the identification and correction of noncompliance in the State under a single indicator. States currently report Indicator 18 data using a data table that is disaggregated by each compliance indicator (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). Within that disaggregation, States are required to report: (1) whether the identified noncompliance is specific to the compliance indicator requirements or based on other IDEA requirements related to the indicator; (2) the source of the noncompliance (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements); and, (3) provide a description of how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data, as well as how the State

verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

Changes: None.