OSEP SPP/APR Online Submission Module

Part B Collection Tool

Released October 1, 2017

How to Read the Collection Tool

Fields in data tables can be prepopulated with data from other sources (EDFacts, eMAPS, etc), preloaded with data from previous SPP and APR submissions, calculated values, or blank fillable fields that will allow users to enter data. Cells throughout this document will be highlighted to indicate the type of field. White blank fields in data tables are fillable fields that allow users to enter data.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Note: Narrative information around state processes provided on your previous SPP/APR will be preloaded in the narrative fields for the current SPP/APR. All of this information is editable in the system. If you do not want the narrative fields loaded with the previous year's narrative, go to the Tools page and select the "Do not preload narrative data" box.

The system will have some built in business rules and calculations. This information is described in purple italic font, as is additional description of what should be provided.

- *Explanatory text*

Narrative fields will display as outlined boxes. These fields will accept rich text in the system.

Narrative field prompt

You will find a key at the bottom of each page, as you see in the footer of this page.

Introduction

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System

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

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.

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.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Apply this to all Part B results indicators

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2015-2016.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	**FFY 2014 Data**

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma" divided by "Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate"

Graduation Conditions

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

◉ 4-year ACGR

◉ Extended ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

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. ~~*Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain why.*~~

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Required Actions from FFY 2015

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Preloaded historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 2: Drop Out

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2015-2016.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≤												
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≤			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

○ Option 1
○ Option 2

    If using Option 2, has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012?

        ○ Yes
        ○ No

    If yes, please include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Input Data	Data
(a) Graduated with a regular high school diploma	
(b) Received a certificate	
(c) Reached maximum age	
(d) Dropped out	
(e) Died	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out *[d]*	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) *[a + b + c + d + e]*	FFY 2016 Data

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Describe what counts as dropping out for all youth.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?
○ Yes
○ No

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

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?	

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?	

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP/AMO	FFY 2016 Data

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP/AMO" divided by "Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size."

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Reporting Group Selection

Add rows to this and all subsequent tables where necessary to account for all of your grade groups.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A													
B													
C													

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data: Reading

Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Actual												
B		Target ≥												
		Actual												
C		Target ≥												
		Actual												

Historical Data: Math

Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Actual												
B		Target ≥												
		Actual												
C		Target ≥												
		Actual												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets: Reading

FFY	2016	2017	2018
A ≥			
B ≥			
C ≥			

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets: Math

FFY	2016	2017	2018
A ≥			

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY	2016	2017	2018
B ≥			
C ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

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											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Mathematics 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											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

The "Number of children with IEPs" is the total "Number of children with IEPs" for all grades included in the grade group. The "Number of Children with IEPs Participating" is the total of "b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations" plus "c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations" plus "d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards" plus "e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards" plus "f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards" for all grades included in the grade group.

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: the "Number of Children with IEPs Participating" divided by the "Number of Children with IEPs."

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data
A			
B			

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Group	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data
C			

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data
A			
B			
C			

Public Reporting Information

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

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Reporting Group Selection

Add rows to this and all subsequent tables where necessary to account for all of your grade groups.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A													
B													
C													

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data: Reading

Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Actual												
B		Target ≥												
		Actual												
C		Target ≥												
		Actual												

Historical Data: Math

Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Actual												
B		Target ≥												
		Actual												
C		Target ≥												
		Actual												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets: Reading

FFY	2016	2017	2018
A ≥			
B ≥			
C ≥			

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets: Math

FFY	2016	2017	2018
A ≥			
B ≥			
C ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Reading assessment 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											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Mathematics assessment 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											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

The "Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned" is the total of "Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned" for all grades included in the grade group. The "Number of Children with IEPs Proficient" is the total of "b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level" plus "c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

against grade level" plus "d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level" plus "e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level" plus "f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level" for all grades included in the grade group.

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: the "Number of Children with IEPs Proficient" divided by the "Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned."

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data
A			
B			
C			

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Grade Group	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data
A			
B			
C			

Public Reporting Information

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

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: 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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2015-2016.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Has the State established a minimum n size requirement?

○ Yes
○ No

If yes, then the ONLY denominator option is the "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size." 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.

~~Provide either the number of districts in the state OR the number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size~~

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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
	The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table **not including correction of noncompliance**

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2015 using 2014-2015 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.Description of review

	The State DID NOT 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 NOT 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 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.
		Description here

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Explanatory text

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: 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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2015-2016.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 Data

Has the State established a minimum n size requirement?

○ Yes

○ No

If yes, then the ONLY denominator option is the "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size." 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.

~~**FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data**~~

~~Please enter either the "number of districts in the state" OR the "number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size"~~

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do	Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	not comply with requirements			

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? _____

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements" divided by "Number of districts in the State" or "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size" depending upon the type of denominator the State indicates will be used.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table not including correction of noncompliance

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2015 using 2014-2015 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.Description of review

	The State DID NOT 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). 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.
	Description here

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Data												
B		Target ≤												
		Data												
C		Target ≤												
		Data												

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥			
Target B ≤			
Target C ≤			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Input Data

	Data
Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	
A. Children inside the regular class 80 percent or more	
B. Children inside the regular class less than 40 percent	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Data
c1. Children in separate schools	
c2. Children in residential facilities	
c3. Children in homebound/hospital placements	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data
A. Regular class 80 percent or more			
B. Regular class less than 40 percent			
C. Separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Data												
B		Target ≤												
		Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥			
Target B ≤			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

Input Data

	Data
Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	
A. Children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	
b1. Children attending separate special education class	
b2. Children attending separate school	
b3. Children attending residential facility	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program			
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility *[b1+b2+b3]*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A1		Target ≥												
A1		Data												
A2		Target ≥												
A2		Data												
B1		Target ≥												
B1		Data												
B2		Target ≥												
B2		Data												
C1		Target ≥												
C1		Data												
C2		Target ≥												
C2		Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥			
Target A2 ≥			
Target B1 ≥			
Target B2 ≥			
Target C1 ≥			
Target C2 ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	

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

	Number of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data
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. *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
A2. 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. *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data
B1. 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. *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
B2. 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. *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data
C1. 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. *Expected calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*			
C2. 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. *Expected calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*			

Explain your different calculation methodology, if applicable

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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

    If no, please explain.

Was sampling used?	

If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	

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

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS~~F~~) process?	

If not, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers_." ~~and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.~~

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

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

If you use a separate data collection for preschool children and will NOT be providing the data separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Procedures to Provide Valid and Reliable Data

Historical Data and Targets: Preschool Children Reported Separately

If you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children and will be providing the data for preschool children separately, please use the following tables instead.

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Preschool		Target ≥												
		Data												
School Age		Target ≥												
		Data												

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target			
School-age Target			

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2016 Data
Preschool			
School Age			

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities" divided by "Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities"

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	

Was sampling used?	

	If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	

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

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Was a ~~collection tool~~ survey used?	

	If so, is it a new or revised ~~collection tool~~survey?	

	The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes or no)~~Does the data accurately represent the demographics of the State?~~	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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

If it is a new or revised ~~collection tool~~survey, you will be asked to submit a copy of the ~~collection tool~~survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State. 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.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?

○ Yes
○ No

    If yes, then the ONLY denominator option is the "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size." 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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

~~FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data~~

~~Please enter either the "number of districts in the state" OR the "number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size"~~

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 in the State	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?	

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification" divided by "Number of districts in the State" or "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size" depending upon the type of denominator the State indicates will be used.

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). ~~***Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation***~~

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.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table **not including correction of noncompliance**

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Please enter either the "number of districts in the state" OR the "number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size"

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?	

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: "Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification" divided by "Number of districts in the State" or "Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size" depending upon the type of denominator the State indicates will be used.

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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).

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

~~Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation~~

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table **not including correction of noncompliance**

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**	**Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected**
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2016 Data

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: a divided by b

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.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

If you select this second option, answer the following question.

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? _If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b)._

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

State monitoring

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table not including correction of noncompliance

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

October 2017

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: 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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	
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.	
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	
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.	

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. *Expected calculation: c/(a-b-d-e-f)*	**Numerator** *(c)*	**Denominator** *(a-b-d-e-f)*	**FFY 2016 Data**

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	
Calculation: a-b-c-d-e-f	

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, ~~or~~ 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.

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

	State monitoring
	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.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table not including correction of noncompliance

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

Add rows as needed

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data												

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2016 Data

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: the "Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition" divided by the "Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above."

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

◯ Yes
◯ No

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
◯ No

If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator ~~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.~~

[   ]

If no, please explain.

[   ]

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

[   ]

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table not including correction of noncompliance

[   ]

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2015

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2015 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 20XX			
FFY 20XY			

Answer both of the "findings of noncompliance verified as corrected" questions for each year where you are reporting that findings have been corrected. Answer the question regarding actions taken for each year that there were findings identified that have not been verified as corrected.

FFY 20XX Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements	
Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance	

FFY 20XY Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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:

- **A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
- **B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
- **C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

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

Collect data by September 2017 on students who left school during 2015-2016, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
A		Target ≥												
		Data												
B		Target ≥												
		Data												
C		Target ≥												
		Data												

FFY 2016 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥			
Target B ≥			
Target C ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

FFY 2016 Data

Input Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	
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)	
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).	

	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 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education *(1)*			
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school *(1 +2)*			
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)*			

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

◯ 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.

Describe the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

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
○ 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.

Was sampling used?	
If so, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.	

If your previously-approved sampling plan has changed, you will be asked to submit your sampling plan for approval.

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2016 Data

The FFY 2014 data is calculated: "3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements" divided by "3.1 Number of resolutions sessions"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

The data provided for this indicator will be from school year 2016-2017.

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:												
FFY	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Target ≥												
Data												

FFY 2014 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 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 2016 Data

The FFY 2016 data is calculated: ("2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints" + "2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints" divided by "2.1 Number of mediations held"

Required Actions

Actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 response table

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Historical Data and Targets

Historical Data

Baseline Year:				
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**
Target ≥				
Data				

FFY 2017 – FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	**2017**	**2018**
Target ≥		

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP.

A description of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Optional Description

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for children with disabilities.

(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education, which impact children with disabilities.

(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State educational agency (SEA), as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for LEA Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support LEAs in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies. Include communication strategies, stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; and who will be in charge of implementing. Include how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA (and other State agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP. Specify its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; the evaluation, assessment of the progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for LEA implementation of EBPs; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Prepopulated historical data	Prepopulated data from other sources	Calculated

Explanatory text