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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

Schools in Iowa were closed beginning on March 15, 2020 by order of the Governor, and remained closed through the end of the 2019-2020 school year. Thus the COVID-19 pandemic impacted Iowa’s ability to collect and complete data for some indicators reported in this APR. Additional information regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on data is included under each indicator.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

327

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Since 1974, Iowa has been divided into intermediate agencies (Area Education Agencies) to provide specialized services. The AEAs were created in order to provide equity in the provision of programs and services across counties or merged areas. One key difference between Iowa’s AEA system and intermediate units in other states is that Iowa’s AEAs are mandatory. It is also mandatory that each local school district be assigned to an area education agency that will provide the services the school district needs. The AEAs carry special education general supervision and compliance responsibilities and the charge to provide the services needed by the local school districts. Their primary role is provision of special education support services to individuals under the age of 21 years requiring special education and related services, media services to all children through grade 12, and other educational services to pupils and education staff. The AEAs also provide the system used to locate and identify students suspected of having disabilities and provide the personnel to conduct evaluation activities in collaboration with LEAs. Iowa’s Part B general supervision system is a partnership between the Department of Education and the AEAs and is multifaceted. The components include: 1) support practices that improve educational outcomes for students (described under technical assistance and professional development); 2) use of multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance within one year; and 3) mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and enforce compliance.   
Dispute Resolution. The State uses a system for dispute resolution including both informal and formal mechanisms. Resolution Facilitation is a way to resolve differences instead of, or before use of, formal proceedings provided by the State. The SEA has written procedures for resolving any complaint, including a complaint filed by an organization or individual from another state. The SEA has widely disseminated these procedures to parents and other interested individuals, including the Iowa Parent Training and Information Center, Disability Rights Iowa, independent living centers and other appropriate entities. A mediator assists in resolving differences between parents, schools and private service providers. Mediation is voluntary on the part of all parties and conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation can occur at any time, even prior to the filing of a due process hearing request. Whenever a due process hearing request is filed, the parties involved in the dispute have an opportunity for an impartial due process hearing.   
Monitoring - Area Education Agencies (intermediate agencies). The SEA annually conducts desk audits for each AEA and follows up with accreditation visits if determined necessary. During this visit AEA documents are reviewed and internal (AEA staff) and external (Staff from school districts served by the AEA) interviews are held that relate to the agency’s five-year Comprehensive Improvement Plan and the services the agency provides in accordance with the eight required standards and one optional standard outlined in Chapter 72 of the Iowa Code. During the accreditation process, the special education services the agency provides are a part of each of the eight required standards. A targeted interview is held with special education staff; topics discussed during this interview include the agency’s State Performance Plan indicator data, LEA (district) special education procedural compliance data, the AEA’s general supervision responsibilities and other AEA data used by the Iowa Department of Education to make the accreditation determination regarding the agency.   
Monitoring - Local Education Agencies (school districts). The SEA annually conducts desk audits for each LEA and follows up with accreditation visits if determined necessary. The Accreditation Site Visit process may include Iowa Chapter 12, Equity, Special Education and Title Programs; dependent upon findings of the desk audit. During a site review, the district provides requested information, including additional information as a result of the Iowa Department of Education’s procedural compliance review related to the implementation of IDEA. Data are collected through a Web-based tool, with a report developed for each district to identify individual student noncompliance and whether or not the issues are identified as a system level issue. If noncompliance is identified as a system level issue, the district must respond to the corrective action identified within the report. The AEA then monitors and verifies the correction of individual noncompliance as well as the implementation of the required corrective action. Individual student noncompliance and system level corrective action are to be fully implemented as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification. After the AEA verifies that all corrections have been made, documentation is submitted to the SEA.   
During the site visit, multiple interviews take place on a variety of topics. The on-site visit allows for conversations to occur regarding student performance and implementation of the special education practices in the district. Interview groups include community partners, parents, teachers, school board, district administrators, and support staff. One of the interviews allows for district staff to be interviewed with a specific focus on special education practices and district level special education data. A comprehensive report written to the district identifies strengths, recommendations and any noncompliance in all of the areas reviewed during the site visit. Any special education noncompliance identified during the site visit must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification.

**Technical Assistance System**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

Iowa’s technical assistance system as distinguished by OSEP, is intricately entwined with Iowa’s professional development system. This section, therefore, describes the structures which support technical assistance and professional development. The activities and strategies used for technical assistance and professional development are explained within the description of Iowa’s professional development system.   
Iowa’s technical assistance system has long been a partnership between the Department of Education, AEAS and LEAs. Recently, however, that partnership has reorganized into something known as Collaborating for Iowa’s Kids (C4K). C4K is a partnership among area education agencies, the Iowa Department of Education and local school districts. The intent of C4K is to work more effectively and efficiently as a full educational system to accomplish a few agreed upon priorities within a multi-tiered system of support as a framework to implement Iowa’s rigorous standards. The first areas of focus are early literacy and closing the achievement gaps with the ultimate goal that every child is proficient by the end of third grade.   
Collaborating for Iowa's Kids (C4K) was conceptualized within Iowa's Area Education Agency system as a way to more effectively work as partners with the Iowa Department of Education (DE) as well as across the AEA system. Established in 2011-12, the partnership includes:   
- Collective commitment across AEAs and the DE to work as a unified system;   
- Agreement that the role of the DE is to set direction and lead, and the role of the AEAs is to implement;   
- Agreement that LEAs are integral, and need to be included in C4K; and   
- Commitment to focus efforts and resources on selected priorities.   
C4K accomplishes broad stakeholder involvement through a complex set of structures, including: governance teams (oversight, work, task, and implementation teams), external coaches and building leadership teams. These new structures have provided leverage in four ways: (1) Alignment of resources, including fiscal and personnel, focused on one priority (literacy) across priority areas that have the greatest success across children/youth (work teams); (2) Collaboration of the DE, AEA and LEAs as part of C4K; (3) Identification/development of evidence-based frameworks, strategies and programs by experts in the field regardless of affiliation or location; and (4) Intentional statewide scaling based on implementation science.

**Professional Development System**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.**

Using the structures described above, Iowa employs its own model of professional development, established from evidence based practices of professional learning. The Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) is an integrated cycle of planning, ongoing implementation and evaluation. It emphasizes ongoing support and feedback for the learning and application of new skills. Iowa Administrative Code requires each district’s professional development plans to meet the following standards:   
1. Align with the Iowa teaching standards and criteria;   
2. Deliver research-based instructional strategies aligned with the student achievement goals established by the district;   
3. Deliver professional development training and learning opportunities that are targeted at improvement of instruction and designed with the following components:   
a. Student achievement data and analysis;   
b. Theory about learning and instruction;   
c. Classroom demonstration and practice;   
d. Classroom observation and self-reflection;   
e. Teacher collaboration and study of teacher implementation; and   
f. Integration of instructional technology, if applicable;   
4. Include an evaluation component of professional development that measures improvement in instructional practice and its impact on student learning; and   
2. 5. Support the professional development needs of district certified staff responsible for instruction.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

A link to Iowa’s current SPP/APR on the IDEA website is located on IDE’s website under the Special Education Public Reporting section: https://educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/special-education-public-reporting.  
  
When made available, the FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be posted on the same IDE website in the same location.  
Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators are posted annually by June 1. District and AEA profiles are posted at: https://educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/special-education-public-reporting

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.  
  
The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Iowa has received technical assistance from a number of OSEP funded centers as well as private entities throughout the reporting period. OSEP funded centers that have provided technical assistance to Iowa include Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), IDEA Data Center (IDC), National  
Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), and National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT). The later two centers are most relevant to Iowa's needs to meet requirements. Actions taken as the result of technical assistance will focus on the work with NCSI and NTACT.   
  
Iowa has participated in technical assistance provided by NCSI in a number of ways, including participation in general webinars, accessing resources collected and posted by NCSI and direct technical support provided by NCSI staff. Iowa staff attended the Learning Collaboratives event hosted by NCSI but had not committed to joining one by the time that COVID hit. Iowa has not, therefore, yet joined one of the three primary Learning Collaboratives sponsored by NCSI. The State Director of Special Education has, however, joined the State Education Agency Leadership (SEAL) Collaborative. Additionally, she meets monthly with NCSI staff in individual consultation. Finally, an NCSI staff person meets at least monthly with the Iowa Education Consultant who leads Iowa's monitoring and general supervision responsibilities. The primary outcome of this work is that Iowa is refining it's processes for identifying districts in need of additional support. The intent of this work is to better identify districts in need of support and connect them with evidence based strategies that directly address their needs. For example, Iowa's SSIP and SPDG are focused on specially designed early literacy. The evidence based practices from this work and the infrastructure supports for coaching will be available to those districts identified through Iowa's improved identification strategies which were refined with help from NCSI.  
  
Iowa continues to contract with Drs. Unruh and Rowe to improve secondary transition (B13) data. Both these individuals are partners within NTACT and have considerable expertise in the area of secondary transition. Actions taken prior to schools closing in March included refinement of a facilitated process for districts to review their data, training of facilitators and facilitation with districts identified in most need of support. An action planning process was developed and alignment of evidence based strategies with the action planning process was begun. Work also focused on developing ways that B13 data can be collected in Iowa's new statewide IEP/IFSP system set to launch in 2021-22 school year. This will permit the use of real time data to identify districts, schools or IEP teams/teachers in need of extra support for every IEP, every year.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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))

**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).

**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.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

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.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

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.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 83.12% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 91.00% | 93.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | 76.35% | 76.99% | 69.51% | 74.25% | 76.51% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 4,573 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 83.12% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 4,573 | 76.51% | 95.00% | 83.12% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

Extended ACGR

**If extended, provide the number of years**

5

**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*.***

Graduation in the State of Iowa is defined as (1) a student who has received a regular diploma who completed all unmodified district graduation requirements in the standard number of four years, or (2) students receiving a regular diploma from an alternative placement within the district, or who have had the requirements modified in accordance with a disability. Students who have finished the high school program but did not earn a diploma, or earned a certificate of attendance or other credential in lieu of a diploma are not considered graduates.  
  
Data for this measure are reported using the five-year graduation rate. The five-year fixed cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in the cohort (denominator) who graduate with a regular high school diploma in five years or less by the number of first-time 9th graders enrolled in the fall five years earlier minus the number of students who transferred out plus the total number of students who transferred in. Please note that data reported for the current reporting period are from one year previous as described in the table below.   
  
Title I Cohort Graduation Rate = (FG + TIG) / (F + TI - TO)   
FG: First-time 9th grade students in fall of 2014 and graduated in 2019 or sooner   
TIG: Students who transferred in grades 9 to 12 and graduate in 2019 or sooner   
F: First-time 9th grade students in fall of 2014   
TI: Transferred in between 2015 and 2018  
TO: Transfer out between 2015 and 2018 (including emigrates and deceased)   
First-time freshmen and transferred-in students include: resident students attending a public school in the district; non-resident students open-enrolled in, whole-grade sharing in, or tuition in; and foreign students on Visa. Those excluded are: home-schooled and nonpublic schooled students; public school students enrolled in another district but taking courses on a part-time basis; and foreign exchange students. Students receiving regular diplomas are included as graduates in the numerator. Early graduates are included in the original cohort.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The state updated the baseline to account for the change from reporting a 4-year rate to a 5-year rate. The Special Education Advisory Panel (one of Iowa's primary stakeholder groups), transition coordinators, and superintendents across the state have requested that the 5-year rate be reported instead. Iowa has also been in the practice of including the 5-year graduation rate in reporting. Thus, when approached by OSEP with the option to use either the 4-year rate or exercise the reported extended year rate, the state was well-positioned to make the switch.   
  
COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being from the year before the reporting year (2018-2019), there is no impact from COVID the state’s ability to collect the data, or on reliability, validity, or completeness. Thus, no steps were needed to mitigate data collection. The state anticipates the SY 2019-2020 data reported on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in 2022 will show an impact from COVID-19.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

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.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2:

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.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

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 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.

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.

OPTION 2:

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.

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.

Options 1 and 2:

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.

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.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2012 | 21.49% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 21.00% | 20.50% | 20.00% | 19.50% | 19.00% |
| Data | 17.54% | 18.05% | 19.79% | 19.34% | 19.02% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 19.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 2,911 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 53 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 690 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 19 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 690 | 3,673 | 19.02% | 19.00% | 18.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

According to the CCD definition, a dropout is an individual who   
1. was enrolled in school at some time during the 2018-2019 funding year (on or after October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019)   
2. is not enrolled as of Count Day 2019   
3. has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved education program; and   
4. does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:   
a. transfer to another public school district, private school, or state-or district-approved education program   
b. temporary absence due to suspension or school-approved illness; or   
c. death   
  
For the purpose of this definition: 1) The school year is the 12-month period of time beginning on Count Day.   
2) Dropouts from the previous summer reported for the year and grade in which they fail to enroll. For example, a student completing 10th grade in 2018-2019, who does not enroll the next year would be reported as an 11th grade dropout for 2019-2020.   
3) Individuals who are not accounted for on Count Day of the current year are considered dropouts   
4) A school completer is an individual who graduated from high school or completed a state- or district- approved educational program upon receipt of formal recognition of school authorities.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being from the year before the reporting year (2018-2019), there is no impact from COVID the state’s ability to collect the data, or on reliability, validity, or completeness. Thus, no steps were needed to mitigate data collection. The state anticipates the SY 2019-2020 data reported on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in 2022 will show an impact from COVID-19.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

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.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** | HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 98.89% | Actual | 98.70% | 98.02% | 98.43% | 98.23% | 98.90% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 99.35% | Actual | 98.79% | 98.54% | 98.45% | 98.80% | 98.55% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 99.26% | Actual | 98.51% | 98.38% | 98.77% | 99.18% | 99.02% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 99.20% | Actual | 98.39% | 97.71% | 97.93% | 98.70% | 98.15% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 99.54% | Actual | 97.78% | 97.57% | 97.68% | 97.99% | 98.42% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 99.53% | Actual | 96.49% | 96.67% | 96.83% | 96.84% | 97.60% |
| **G** | HS | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **G** | HS | 97.61% | Actual | 93.27% | 93.79% | 93.35% | 95.18% | 95.48% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 98.85% | Actual | 98.68% | 98.25% | 98.39% | 98.39% | 98.88% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 99.22% | Actual | 98.83% | 98.56% | 98.48% | 98.71% | 98.55% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 99.04% | Actual | 98.57% | 98.38% | 98.77% | 99.09% | 99.02% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 99.10% | Actual | 98.39% | 97.85% | 98.14% | 98.68% | 98.18% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 99.42% | Actual | 97.88% | 97.46% | 97.56% | 98.05% | 98.43% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2005 | Target ≥ | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 99.29% | Actual | 96.60% | 96.61% | 96.82% | 96.75% | 97.63% |
| **G** | HS | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **G** | HS | 97.53% | Actual | 92.45% | 93.47% | 93.04% | 94.53% | 95.54% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade 5 | 95.00% |
| Reading | D >= | Grade 6 | 95.00% |
| Reading | E >= | Grade 7 | 95.00% |
| Reading | F >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% |
| Reading | G >= | HS | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade 5 | 95.00% |
| Math | D >= | Grade 6 | 95.00% |
| Math | E >= | Grade 7 | 95.00% |
| Math | F >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% |
| Math | G >= | HS | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 98.90% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 98.55% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 99.02% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 98.15% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 98.42% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 97.60% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 95.48% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 98.88% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 98.55% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 99.02% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 98.18% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 98.43% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 97.63% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 95.54% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: In the spring of 2020, the Iowa Department of Education sent a request to the U.S. Department of Education (which was subsequently approved) to waive the requirements to administer all federal required assessments in the 2019-20 school year due to the global outbreak of the coronavirus, also known as COVID-19. As such, the Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP) was not administered in 2019-20 and there is no data to report for either Indicator 3B or Indicator 3C.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

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.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

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.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** | HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 24.72% | Actual | 37.41% | 36.89% | 35.10% | 34.23% | 24.71% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 26.56% | Actual | 35.93% | 35.21% | 34.62% | 33.82% | 26.56% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 22.34% | Actual | 35.43% | 34.74% | 34.11% | 35.05% | 22.34% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 22.03% | Actual | 30.76% | 29.71% | 30.19% | 30.32% | 22.03% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 21.20% | Actual | 30.82% | 28.40% | 29.00% | 28.24% | 21.22% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 19.27% | Actual | 27.27% | 26.27% | 26.96% | 26.05% | 19.27% |
| **G** | HS | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **G** | HS | 17.99% | Actual | 32.00% | 28.08% | 28.97% | 26.68% | 17.99% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 37.34% | Actual | 48.06% | 48.63% | 43.92% | 43.03% | 37.34% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 33.12% | Actual | 44.13% | 44.04% | 43.00% | 38.88% | 33.12% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 27.66% | Actual | 35.56% | 35.32% | 34.59% | 34.91% | 27.66% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 26.71% | Actual | 31.78% | 30.64% | 30.61% | 29.54% | 26.71% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 24.35% | Actual | 41.40% | 42.08% | 39.55% | 40.06% | 24.35% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 22.94% | Actual | 27.37% | 26.49% | 25.81% | 25.37% | 22.94% |
| **G** | HS | 2018 | Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **G** | HS | 13.33% | Actual | 40.00% | 38.05% | 37.96% | 34.95% | 13.33% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 100.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 4 | 100.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade 5 | 100.00% |
| Reading | D >= | Grade 6 | 100.00% |
| Reading | E >= | Grade 7 | 100.00% |
| Reading | F >= | Grade 8 | 100.00% |
| Reading | G >= | HS | 100.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 100.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 4 | 100.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade 5 | 100.00% |
| Math | D >= | Grade 6 | 100.00% |
| Math | E >= | Grade 7 | 100.00% |
| Math | F >= | Grade 8 | 100.00% |
| Math | G >= | HS | 100.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 24.71% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 26.56% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 22.34% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 22.03% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 21.22% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 19.27% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 17.99% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 37.34% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 33.12% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 27.66% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 26.71% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 24.35% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 22.94% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 13.33% | 100.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In the spring of 2020, the Iowa Department of Education sent a request to the U.S. Department of Education (which was subsequently approved) to waive the requirements to administer all federal required assessments in the 2019-20 school year due to the global outbreak of the coronavirus, also known as COVID-19. As such, the Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP) was not administered in 2019-20 and there is no data to report for either Indicator 3B or Indicator 3C.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

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.

**Measurement**

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.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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.

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), 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:

--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

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

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.

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.

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.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.36% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 1.50% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.30% | 1.30% |
| Data | 1.76% | 1.81% | 1.52% | 1.61% | 0.92% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 1.30% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 5 | 324 | 0.92% | 1.30% | 1.54% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The state attributes slippage to annual fluctuations in the data.

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The State’s definition of significant discrepancy is a rate ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any single year of data. The State uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation. The district’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days is compared to the State’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days. The district’s rate is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP removed for 10 or more days by the total number of students with an IEP in the district. The calculation for the State’s rate is the same. The rate ratio used to determine significant discrepancy is the district’s rate divided by the State’s rate.   
In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an “administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons,” with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as “a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons,” (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006). A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP to be considered in the analysis.   
The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a rate ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being from the year before the reporting year (2018-2019), there is no impact from COVID on these data. The state anticipates that data from the 2019-2020 school year reported on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in 2022 will have an impact.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board polices, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.  
The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).  
The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008*.***

Completed reviews (self-assessment) and the Corrective Action Plan are reviewed by the State and a desk audit is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the Corrective Action Plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The LEA completed reviews (self-assessment) and created a corrective action plan to address noncompliance, which are reviewed by the State. In addition, a desk audit, using the State data system, is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the corrective action plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.   
The LEA is required to submit results of the implementation of their corrective action plan to verify the noncompliance has been corrected in future occurrences. The State verified that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by reviewing updated information in the State data system of a similar nature to the area of noncompliance identified in the original finding.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected. The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2017 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2017**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The previously uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2017 occurred at the same district. The district received intensive, on-site visits from the Iowa Department of Education, as well as specialized support from expert mentors to address systemic issues in the district, including special education. Through these visits, progress status reports, and reviewing updated information in the state data system of a similar nature to the area of noncompliance identified in the original finding, the State verified that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected. The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

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.

**Measurement**

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.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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.

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), 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

--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

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

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 requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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.

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.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.55% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 2.05% | 1.51% | 0.61% | 0.32% | 0.62% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 1 | 321 | 0.62% | 0% | 0.31% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The State’s definition of significant discrepancy is a rate ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any one or more race/ethnicity category for any single year of data. The State uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation. The district’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days is compared to the State’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days for each race/ethnicity category. The district’s rate is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity removed for 10 or more days by the total number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity in the district. The calculation for the State’s rate is the same. The rate ratio used to determine significant discrepancy is the district’s rate divided by the State’s rate for each race/ethnicity category. In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an “administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons,” with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as “a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons,” (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006).   
A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP in any one or more race/ethnicity categories to be considered in the analysis.   
The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a rate ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being from the year before the reporting year (2018-2019), there is no impact from COVID on these data. The state anticipates that data from the 2019-2020 school year reported on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in 2022 will have an impact.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board polices, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.  
  
The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008*.***

Completed reviews (self-assessment) and the Corrective Action Plan are reviewed by the State and a desk audit is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the Corrective Action Plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The LEA completed reviews (self-assessment) and created a corrective action plan to address noncompliance, which are reviewed by the State. In addition, a desk audit, using the State data system, is conducted to verify findings. The desk audit consists of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings is made by the State and a review of the corrective action plan is conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements. The LEA is required to submit results of the implementation of their corrective action plan to verify the noncompliance has been corrected in future occurrences.   
The State verified that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by reviewing updated information in the State data system of a similar nature to the area of noncompliance identified in the original finding.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected.   
The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

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.

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.

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.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| A | 49.00% | Data | 64.92% | 65.63% | 66.15% | 69.44% | 70.61% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 9.00% | 8.50% | 8.00% | 7.50% | 7.00% |
| B | 10.80% | Data | 8.60% | 8.90% | 8.45% | 8.14% | 7.78% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 2.90% | 2.80% | 2.70% | 2.60% | 2.50% |
| C | 4.00% | Data | 1.80% | 1.57% | 1.51% | 1.52% | 1.37% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 65.00% |
| Target B <= | 7.00% |
| Target C <= | 2.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 61,842 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 44,348 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,466 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 555 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 181 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 23 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 44,348 | 61,842 | 70.61% | 65.00% | 71.71% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,466 | 61,842 | 7.78% | 7.00% | 7.22% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 759 | 61,842 | 1.37% | 2.50% | 1.23% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Note: Iowa is exercising the final year of flexibility for this indicator, and will report 5-year olds in kindergarten with the school age (6-21) data beginning with SY 2020-2021 data for the SPP/APR due in February 2022.   
  
COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being sourced from fall 2019-2020 enrollment, there was no impact from COVID-19 on the state’s ability to collect the data, or on reliability, validity, or completeness. The state anticipates the SY 2020-2021 data to be more impacted by COVID-19.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

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.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 41.00% | 42.00% | 43.00% | 44.00% | 45.00% |
| A | 38.54% | Data | 34.36% | 33.73% | 33.58% | 32.61% | 32.36% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 8.00% | 7.00% | 6.00% | 5.00% | 4.00% |
| B | 9.35% | Data | 7.17% | 6.54% | 6.42% | 5.68% | 5.32% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 45.00% |
| Target B <= | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 7,831 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 2,602 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 271 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 9 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 5 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 2,602 | 7,831 | 32.36% | 45.00% | 33.23% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 285 | 7,831 | 5.32% | 4.00% | 3.64% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Note: Iowa is exercising the final year of flexibility for this indicator, and will report 5-year olds in kindergarten with the school age (6-21) data beginning with SY 2020-2021 data for the SPP/APR due in February 2022.   
  
COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being sourced from fall 2019-2020 enrollment, there was no impact from COVID-19 on the state’s ability to collect the data, or on reliability, validity, or completeness. The state anticipates the SY 2020-2021 data to be more impacted by COVID-19.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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 it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

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.

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.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**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.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** 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.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**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.

**Instructions**

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 General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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.

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).

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.

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.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 63.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% |
| A1 | 66.25% | Data | 60.92% | 62.96% | 63.03% | 65.06% | 55.92% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 56.00% | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% |
| A2 | 53.54% | Data | 54.69% | 55.84% | 56.72% | 57.60% | 54.33% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 71.00% | 72.00% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% |
| B1 | 73.97% | Data | 68.42% | 72.11% | 71.77% | 70.83% | 65.00% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 30.00% | 31.50% | 33.00% | 34.50% | 36.00% |
| B2 | 34.92% | Data | 29.44% | 32.01% | 32.23% | 37.21% | 33.17% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 61.00% | 62.00% | 63.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% |
| C1 | 56.67% | Data | 56.65% | 58.79% | 59.19% | 59.27% | 58.22% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 63.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% |
| C2 | 54.98% | Data | 62.27% | 60.13% | 62.80% | 63.24% | 61.29% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 67.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 60.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 75.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 36.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 65.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 67.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

2,424

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 32 | 1.32% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 639 | 26.36% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 518 | 21.37% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 448 | 18.48% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 787 | 32.47% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 966 | 1,637 | 55.92% | 67.00% | 59.01% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,235 | 2,424 | 54.33% | 60.00% | 50.95% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 30 | 1.24% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 818 | 33.75% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 952 | 39.27% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 527 | 21.74% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 97 | 4.00% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,479 | 2,327 | 65.00% | 75.00% | 63.56% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 624 | 2,424 | 33.17% | 36.00% | 25.74% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 35 | 1.44% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 588 | 24.26% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 353 | 14.56% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 456 | 18.81% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 992 | 40.92% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 809 | 1,432 | 58.22% | 65.00% | 56.49% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,448 | 2,424 | 61.29% | 67.00% | 59.74% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | The state attributes slippage to the two and a half month period of time in which schools were closed due to COVID-19, and voluntary services were inconsistent statewide during that time. |
| **B1** | The state attributes slippage to the two and a half month period of time in which schools were closed due to COVID-19, and voluntary services were inconsistent statewide during that time. |
| **B2** | The state attributes slippage to the two and a half month period of time in which schools were closed due to COVID-19, and voluntary services were inconsistent statewide during that time. |
| **C1** | The state attributes slippage to the two and a half month period of time in which schools were closed due to COVID-19, and voluntary services were inconsistent statewide during that time. |
| **C2** | The state attributes slippage to the two and a half month period of time in which schools were closed due to COVID-19, and voluntary services were inconsistent statewide during that time. |

**Does the State 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? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) is a systematic process to determine children’s functioning compared to same-aged peers and to determine progress in skills and behaviors in the three ECO areas (A, B, C). The ECO data are gathered upon determination of eligibility for special education services. The ECO entry data for the Comparison to Peers are collected as part of the development of the Initial IEP and the ECO exit data for Comparison to Peers and Progress data are collected when the child exits or no longer receives early childhood special education services. These data are reported on the ECO Summary form that was adapted from the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) form developed by the National Early Child Outcomes Center.   
A child's Comparison to Peers rating of his or her skills and behaviors are determined based on a triangulation of multiple sources of data gathered using methods such as Record review, Interview, Observation, and Test/Assessment (RIOT). The IEP Team determines the methods for collecting data based upon the unique needs of the child. The test/assessment instruments may include adaptive and developmental scales and curriculum-based, criterion-referenced and norm-referenced assessments. The ECO Summary form is used to summarize the child’s skills and behaviors in comparison to the functioning expected for the chronological age of the child as well as the child’s progress prior to exiting early childhood special education services in each of the three ECO areas. The ECO Summary form summarizes the analysis of a child's progress based on a triangulation of data such as progress on IEP goals and levels of independence in performance, regardless of the areas addressed on a child’s IEP. The ECO Summary form includes a seven-level outcome rating scale that summarizes each child’s level of functioning in each of the three ECO areas in relation to same-aged peers. A rating of six or seven indicates the ECO area was achieved at an age-appropriate level across a variety of settings and situations, and a rating of one through five indicates the child’s functioning was below age-appropriate skills expected of a child his or her age. Additionally, the IEP Team determines if a child has progressed or acquired new skills or behaviors in each of the three ECO areas and documents the child’s progress by responding to a “yes/no” question on the ECO Summary form.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: COVID-19 impacted the completeness and reliability of these data collected, as schools and AEAs were closed for the last two months of the school year in the spring of 2020. Voluntary services availability was varied during the time period, and the closures of schools and AEAs impacted final assessments.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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.

**Instructions**

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 General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

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.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

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 of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Preschool | 2016 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Preschool | 87.71% | Data | 85.75% | 80.64% | 87.71% | 89.07% | 90.95% |
| School age | 2016 | Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| School age | 84.92% | Data | 73.99% | 76.13% | 84.92% | 85.49% | 85.65% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 91.00% |
| Target B >= | 86.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

| **Group** | **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool |  |  | 90.95% | 91.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| School age |  |  | 85.65% | 86.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

**Percentage of respondent parents**

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

The state answered no because there is no data for this indicator.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

No analysis was conducted because there is no data for this indicator.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: COVID-19 impacted the state’s ability to collect this data altogether, thus there is no data to provide. Iowa typically conducts a census of parents, both of children with disabilities and without, in the spring to fulfill the requirements of Indicator 8. The state relies heavily upon intermediary agencies (AEAs) and districts to communicate with parents to complete the survey. Because schools and AEAs were closed during the time of the survey window, the survey was not conducted. The state considered whether mitigation in the fall was possible. After consulting with the Special Education Advisory Panel and reviewing other data, the state did not collect this data in order to avoid placing an undue burden on families, and to allow schools and AEAs to focus their efforts on returning students to school.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Because the state was unable to collect this data, there is no response group that can be determined representative. In the next survey period, the state will conduct the survey at the same time as the parent school culture and climate survey statewide to attempt to increase awareness and participation. The state will continue to focus on the representativeness of the demographics of the children in special education for whom the parents are responding, and focus on systemic ways to increase response rate and representativeness.

## 8 - OSEP Response

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the State did not provide data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: 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))

**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.

**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 and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., 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.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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), e.g., 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.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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.

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.

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.

Targets must be 0%.

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. 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.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.31% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.31% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 0 | 319 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., 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.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The State’s definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any one or more race/ethnicity category for any single year of data. The district’s risk for a race/ethnicity category is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity by the total number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity in the district. The district’s risk for a non-race/ethnicity category is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each non-race/ethnicity by the total number of students with an IEP of each non-race/ethnicity in the district. The risk ratio used to determine disproportionate representation is the district’s risk for a race/ethnicity divided by the district’s risk for each non-race/ethnicity category.   
A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP in any one or more race/ethnicity categories to be considered in the analysis.   
The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with disproportionate representation by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

**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.**

Iowa has developed a Disproportionality Review that is conducted at the district level. The process involves a formal review in which the district examines and evaluates the following areas:   
Section 1: Review of Data,   
Section 2: Review of Related Issues and Practices,   
Section 3: Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices,   
Section 4: Technical Assistance/Professional Development, and   
Section 5: Results/Findings.  
The data review consists of the district examining its collection and use of data, (e.g., how data are disaggregated, analyzed, used to make decisions, guide practices, etc.). The review of related issues and practices consists of the examination of key areas that have been identified as impacting the area of disproportionality (e.g., utilization of universal screening; administrator/personnel understanding of special education procedures and requirements regarding referral, evaluation, identification, placement, discipline, LRE; attempts to rule out exclusionary factors during the evaluation process, etc.)   
The process also consists of a formal review of policies, procedures and practices regarding the following areas: child find, parent participation, general education interventions, systematic problem-solving process, progress monitoring and data collection, determination of eligibility and evaluations/reevaluations. In addition, the district describes the technical assistance and/or professional development that is being conducted at the district and in districts regarding and/or related to disproportionality (e.g., differentiation of instruction, progress monitoring, cultural competency, understanding racial biases, etc.).   
The districts submit the completed review document and findings to the State. A team of consultants meet to review and discuss the results and findings. A final determination of whether or not disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification is made by the SEA. Districts identified with noncompliance work in collaboration with the State in developing a corrective action plan. Areas of noncompliance are to be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.   
Summary of Process Used to Determine if Disproportionality was Due to Inappropriate Practice. State Policy. The State of Iowa has policies and procedures designed to prevent inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children with disabilities, consistent with 34 CFR § 300.8, 20 U. S. C. 1418 (d), 20 U. S. C 1412 (a) (24), 34 CFR § 300.173. The State of Iowa and has procedures requiring use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information, including information provided by the parent, that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability, and the content of the child’s IEP, consistent with 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (2); 34 CFR § 300.304 (b). The State of Iowa has policies ensuring that assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis, are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, and other requirements for assessment in all areas of suspected disability, by trained and knowledgeable personnel (20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (3)); 34 CFR § 300.304 (c). The State of Iowa has policies that determination that the child has a disability and the educational needs of the child shall be made by a group of qualified professionals and the parent, in accordance with § 300.306 (b), 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (4), 34 CFR § 300.306 (a). The State of Iowa has policies that, in making a determination of eligibility, a child shall not be determined to be a child with a disability if the determinant factor for such determination is: lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction (as defined in Section 1208 (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965); lack of appropriate instruction in math; or limited English proficiency; or if the child does not otherwise meet the eligibility criteria under 34 CFR § 300.8 (a) [20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (5); 34 CFR § 300.306 (b)]. The State of Iowa has policies that, in interpreting evaluation data for the purpose of determining if a child is a child with a disability under § 300.8, and the educational needs of the child, each public agency must draw upon information from a variety of sources, and ensure that information from all these sources is documented and carefully considered [20 U. S. C. 1414 (c); 34 CFR § 300.306 (c)].   
References Gamm, S. (2009). Disproportionality in Special Education: Where and Why Overidentification of Minority Students Occurs. LRP Publications. Kozleski, E. B., & Zion, S. (2007). Preventing Disproportionality by Strengthening District Policies and Procedures – An Assessment and Strategic Planning Process. Downloaded August 1, 2009 from www.nccrest.org.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this indicator data being sourced from fall 2019-2020 enrollment, there was no impact from COVID-19 on the state’s ability to collect the data, or on reliability, validity, or completeness. The state anticipates the SY 2020-2021 data to be more impacted by COVID-19.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**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 specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**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 specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., 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.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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), e.g., 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.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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.

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.

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.

Targets must be 0%.

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.

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.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

Iowa is noncategorical and does not collect disability category data.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the State.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

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.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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.

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.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 87.31% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.86% | 99.30% | 99.28% | 99.00% | 98.48% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9,437 | 8,399 | 98.48% | 100% | 89.00% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

The state attributes slippage due to delays caused by COVID-19 in the spring of 2020. Just over 83% of cases beyond the 60-day timeline were due to COVID-19, which was included as a delay reason when schools initially were ordered to close. Not including these delays, the number of cases delayed beyond 60 days would have been within the range of previous years of data.

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

1,038

**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.**

Range of days beyond 60-day timeline when meeting was held: 61-285  
  
Child's hospitalization/long-term illness: 4  
Natural disaster: 21  
No valid reason: 76  
Parent Failure or Refusal: 73  
Public Health Emergency - COVID 19: 864  
Total: 1038

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**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.**

Reported data were generated from Iowa’s Information Management System. The data reflect all children and youth in Iowa who were evaluated for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel, using the federal definition for 60-day timeline for evaluation (initial evaluations). The data taken from the monitoring system are based on actual (not an average) number of days. Iowa uses the date of receipt of consent by the public agency, as the date for starting the 60-day calendar for completion of the evaluation. The State uses date of evaluation as the date for stopping the calendar for calculating the timeline. At all pertinent times, Iowa’s definition of 60-day timeline is identical to the federal definition contained in the 2005 IDEA amendments and the 2007 IDEA regulations.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: COVID-19 impacted the completeness collection of this data due to school and AEA closures. One mitigation implemented was adding a COVID delay reason to the data management system in order to track which cases were delayed due to the pandemic, versus typical delays.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 192 | 192 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The State uses data from the state database designed to track special education evaluation and placement data. These data are used to determine the extent to which 60-day timelines are being met statewide, and which AEAs are or are not meeting the 60-day timeline. The State continues to emphasize the use of verification reports to help meet the timelines.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every child for whom consent to evaluate was received subsequently received an evaluation, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the AEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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.

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.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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.

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.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 99.83% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.07% | 99.34% | 99.65% | 99.48% | 99.54% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 1,419 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 71 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 1,170 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 6 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 25 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 1,170 | 1,317 | 99.54% | 100% | 88.84% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The state attributes slippage to delays caused by school and AEA closures in the spring of 2020, due to COVID-19. Almost two-thirds of the cases delayed were caused by COVID-19. It is likely that at least half of the cases that were delayed for no valid reason may have also been due to COVID-19 based on the dates of the child's third birthday and subsequent IEP meeting.

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

147

**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.**

Range of days beyond third birthday when eligibility was determined and IEP developed: 1-276  
  
Natural Disaster: 2  
Student's hospitalization/Long-term illness:1  
Public Health Emergency - COVID-19: 95  
No valid reason: 49  
Total: 147

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**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.**

Data reported were generated from Iowa’s Information Management System. The data reflect all children in Iowa who were referred by Part C prior to age three for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: COVID-19 impacted the completeness collection of this data due to school and AEA closures. One mitigation implemented was adding a COVID delay reason to the data management system in order to track which cases were delayed due to the pandemic, versus typical delays.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The State uses data from the state database to determine the extent to which early childhood transition requirements are being met in the state, and to determine which AEAs are and are not meeting those requirements. During the prior reporting period, the State determined that noncompliance was occurring rarely and in isolated cases without any trend. As a result of the root cause analyses, the SEA continued to promote the use of verification reports in the state’s database that alert AEAs to transition requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that very child served in Part C and referred to Part B subsequently received an evaluation and – if eligible – a fully developed IEP, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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.

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.

**Instructions**

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.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 61.69% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 87.56% | 94.74% | 61.69% | 63.86% | 65.88% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3,927 | 5,724 | 65.88% | 100% | 68.61% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**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.**

In order to obtain the sample for the current reporting year, IEPs were randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) The State's sampling plan is a three-year cycle for IEP review. During the first year of the cycle, IEPs from all districts in the state are reviewed. Subsequent samples for years two and three of the cycle are drawn for districts found to be outside the universal tier of support. All samples are drawn using the procedure outlined below. IEPs are randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14 and older in districts in the self-assessment year of Iowa’s school improvement cycle. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) Sample size is determined using an 80% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10%. The sample is drawn with stringent confidence intervals because of the magnitude of decision-making based on the data. The sample is drawn to ensure representativeness. Responses are later assessed to validate the sample on representativeness by age, race and gender. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category). To meet criteria for Indicator B-13, an IEP must contain all six of the elements listed below. Critical Element 1: Interests and Preferences. Interests and preferences as they relate to post-secondary areas and student invitation to the meeting. Critical Element 2: Transition Assessments. Assessment information listing specific data and the source of the data for each post-secondary area of living, learning and working is sufficient to determine that the post-secondary area was assessed. Critical Element 3: Post-secondary Expectations. A statement for each post-secondary area of living, learning, and working is observable, based on assessment information and projects beyond high school. Critical Element 4: Course of Study. The course of study must project to the student’s anticipated end of high school, be based on needs and include: 1) a targeted graduation date; 2) the student’s graduation criteria; and 3) any courses or activities the student needs to pursue his/her post-secondary expectations. Critical Element 5: Annual Goals. All goals must support pursuit of the student’s post-secondary expectations and be well-written and all areas of post-secondary expectations must have a goal or service / activity or the assessment information must clearly indicate there is no need for services in that post-secondary area. Critical Element 6: Services, supports, and activities. Statements must specifically describe the services, supports and activities necessary to meet the needs identified through the transition assessment. Evidence that adult agencies and community organizations were involved as appropriate must also be present. Data were collected through Iowa’s System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), certified by AEA staff and validated through the ISTAR system. Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of IEPs at a high level of confidence using the procedure described above. A response rate of 100 percent was achieved. Sample data for reporting period were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities. Results of this assessment are provided in the attached document titled B13 Representativeness. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | 14 |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: Due to this data being collected prior to the pandemic in March, there was no impact from COVID-19 on the state’s ability collect the data, or on reliability, validity or completeness.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,045 | 2,045 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement is done by analyzing updated data in a sample of IEPs subsequent to the time during which the noncompliance was found, but within the one-year correction period. Districts assigned to the intensive level of support, 50% compliance and below, are required to review a sample of IEPs determined using an 80% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10% during years two and three of the cycle regardless of improved performance. Further, the State used additional data to select 7 districts from the intensive level of support to receive and on-site visit. While the State was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa’s Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every instance of child-specific noncompliance was subsequently corrected on the IEP, and (b) verifying that each district that was performing below 100% compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance occurs in the Iowa’s System to Achieve Results (ISTAR) monitoring system. First, the district verifies that for each child for whom the transition requirements were not met, all required corrections have been made on the IEP. Then the Area Education Agency (AEA) verifies the same information on the IEP. Child-specific noncompliance is considered “verified” when both steps have been completed. While the State was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa’s Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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 within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# 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 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.

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.

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.

**Instructions**

*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 population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* 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.

*Competitive employment* 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:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: 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 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.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* 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).

*Some other employment* 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.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

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 education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“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.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

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 must 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2018 | Target >= | 42.00% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% |
| A | 20.17% | Data | 30.71% | 28.46% | 18.86% | 18.45% | 20.17% |
| B | 2018 | Target >= | 64.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% | 72.00% |
| B | 57.02% | Data | 58.57% | 53.94% | 60.55% | 55.17% | 57.02% |
| C | 2018 | Target >= | 90.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| C | 66.59% | Data | 83.14% | 89.46% | 72.69% | 65.82% | 66.59% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 50.00% |
| Target B >= | 72.00% |
| Target C >= | 94.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 3,582 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 631 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 905 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth 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) | 33 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 708 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 631 | 3,582 | 20.17% | 50.00% | 17.62% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 1,536 | 3,582 | 57.02% | 72.00% | 42.88% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 2,277 | 3,582 | 66.59% | 94.00% | 63.57% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The state attributes slippage on this measure to annual fluctuations in the data, and is considering additional analysis to determine the magnitude of the impact of COVID-19 on this measure. |
| **B** | The state attributes slippage on this measure to the impacts of COVID-19 on employment during the outcome period in 2020, which are reflective of national employment trends during this time. |
| **C** | The state attributes slippage on this measure to annual fluctuations in the data, and is considering additional analysis to determine the magnitude of the impact of COVID-19 on this measure. |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: 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 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.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |

**Include the State’s analyses 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.**

The State uses administrative data compiled from Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to match to a base file of all students who exited school while on an IEP during the 2018-2019 school year. The IWD match rate for 2018-2019 is 100%.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | YES |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: COVID-19 did not impact the state’s ability to collect complete data for this indicator. However, the employment patterns seen nationally during much of 2020 are likely also being shown in the outcome data, with a decrease in competitive employment opportunities and an increase in other, noncompetitive employment.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 5 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 50.00% | 75.00% | 80.00% | 66.67% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 5 | 100.00% |  | 60.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.  
  
COVID-19 Impact Statement: No known impact from COVID-19 on this indicator data’s collection, completeness, validity or reliability.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 9 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 6 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 2 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included Iowa Department of Education staff, the Learning Supports Advisory Team, the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Parent-Educator Connection (PEC), and the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).   
Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. Iowa Department of Education staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Relevant stakeholders include: parents, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, representatives from Institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 74.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| Data | 85.71% | 76.47% | 85.00% | 100.00% | 87.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 75.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 2 | 9 | 87.50% | 75.00% | 88.89% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 Impact Statement: No known impact from COVID-19 on this indicator data’s collection, completeness, validity or reliability.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Barbara Guy

**Title:**

Director of Special Education

**Email:**

barbara.guy@iowa.gov

**Phone:**

5152310681

**Submitted on:**

04/27/21 12:05:27 PM

# ED Attachments

  

1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)