

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

Part B Indicator Measurement Table

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>1. Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).</p> <p>Measurement: States may report 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.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.</p> <p>Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.</p> <p>States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>OPTION 1:</p> <p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>OPTION 1: Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.</p> <p>OPTION 2:</p> <p>Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.</p> <p>Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.</p> <p>OPTION 2:</p> <p>Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.</p> <p>If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.</p> <p>Options 1 and 2:</p> <p>Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications C185 and 188.</p> <p>3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications C175 and 178.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p>	<p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR § 300.160(f), <i>i.e.</i>, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.</p> <p>Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.</p> <p>Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.</p>	<p>If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.</p> <p>Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019),</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))</p>	<p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or • The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs. <p>In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.</p> <p>Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.</p> <p>If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>Targets must be 0% for 4B.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C002.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. 	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.</p>
<p>6. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C089.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100. B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the 	<p><i>Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	(total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. <p>Progress categories for A, B and C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100. c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach 	<p><i>Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).</p> <p>Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.</p> <p>In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.</p> <p>In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:</p> <p>Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 1:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.</p> <p>Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age</p>	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.</p>	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.</p>	<p>Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.</p> <p>While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.</p> <p>Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.</p> <p>Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.</p> <p>If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.</p> <p>States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.</p>

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Data Source: State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n</p>	<p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.</p> <p>States are not required to report on underrepresentation.</p> <p>If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups]] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (<i>i.e.</i>, risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (<i>i.e.</i>, risk numerator and/or risk denominator).</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), <i>e.g.</i>, using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (<i>i.e.</i>, after June 30, 2020).</p>	<p>groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.</p> <p>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 and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (<i>e.g.</i>, review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (<i>e.g.</i>, for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic</p>	<p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet a State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (<i>i.e.</i>, risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (<i>i.e.</i>, risk numerator and/or risk denominator).</p> <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a) (<i>e.g.</i>, using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc.). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate</p>	<p>disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>States are not required to report on underrepresentation.</p> <p>If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.</p> <p>Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.</p> <p>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 specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of FFY 2019 (<i>i.e.</i>, after June 30, 2020).</p>	<p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (<i>e.g.</i>, review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (<i>e.g.</i>, for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p>	<p>Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p>

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays. c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. f. # 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. <p>Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.</p> <p>If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements 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. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR, and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.</p>	<p><i>If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.</p> <p>If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in</p>	<p><i>Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target</i></p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>population. (See <u>General Instructions</u> on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.</p> <p>I. Definitions</p> <p><u>Enrolled in higher education</u> as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.</p> <p><u>Competitive employment</u> as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:</p> <p>Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, <i>i.e.</i>, competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.</p> <p>Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.</p> <p><u>Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training</u> as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two year program).</p> <p><u>Some other employment</u> as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).</p> <p>II. Data Reporting</p> <p>Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; 2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education); 3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed); 4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).</p> <p>“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.</p> <p>III. Reporting On the Measures/Indicators</p> <p>Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.</p> <p>Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school <i>must</i> be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.</p> <p>Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>Include the State’s 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. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.</p> <p>If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.</p>

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
<p>15. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		States are not required to report data at the LEA level.
<p>16. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.</p> <p>States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).</p> <p>If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>

INDICATOR 17 – STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

MONITORING PRIORITY – GENERAL SUPERVISION

INDICATOR: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

MEASUREMENT: The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes the components described below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INDICATOR/MEASUREMENT –

Baseline Data: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 2, 2015, the State must provide FFY 2013 baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2013 SPP/APR, due February 2, 2015, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018. In its FFY 2018 SPP/APR due February 3, 2020, the State extended its target through FFY 2019. The State's FFY 2019 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's FFY 2013 baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2014 through FFY 2019 SPPs/APRs, due February 2016 through February 2021, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFY 2014 through FFY 2019 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

OVERVIEW OF THE THREE PHASES OF THE SSIP: It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis (which the State must include with the February 2, 2015 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2013):

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2016 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2014):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above, the State must include with the February 1, 2017 submission of its SPP/APR for FFY 2015, and update in 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

SPECIFIC CONTENT OF EACH PHASE OF THE SSIP

Refer to FFYs 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

(A) Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2014 through 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

(B) Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2020, i.e., July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

(C) Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2020, *i.e.*, July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1820-0624. It is estimated that respondents will spend approximately 1,700 hours completing the SPP/APR. These times include such things as reviewing instructions, searching any existing data resources, gathering needed data, analyzing collected data, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory (20 U.S.C. 1400, IDEA). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4536 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1820-0624. Note: Please do not return the completed SPP/APR to this address.