

Table A – Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Other: On pages 24 through 26 of the SPP, the State provided data on participation of children with IEPs in assessments. The State did not provide the information required under indicator 3B(b and c). 3B(b) is the number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations as compared with the number of children with IEPs in grades assessed. 3B(c) is the number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations as compared with the number of children with IEPs in grades assessed. On pages 27 through 29 of the SPP, the State addressed indicator 3c, proficiency, but did not provide the information required by indicator 3C (b) and (c). 3C(b) is the number of children with IEPs in grades assessed that are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations as compared with the number of children with IEPs in grades assessed. 3C(c) is the number of children with IEPs in the grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations as compared with the number of children with IEPs in the grades assessed.</p>	<p>The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Other: On page 77 of the SPP, the State submitted data indicating the percentage of children determined eligible by age three by area education agency and total percentage for the State, but did not specify the percentage of children transitioning from Part C to Part B who have an IEP in effect by their third birthdays. Further, the State indicated that while many children</p>	<p>The State must include the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>have IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthdays, some children do not have IEPs developed and implemented until after their third birthdays. In addition, the State did not provide data regarding (a) the number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination; (b) the number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays; and (c) the number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. The State did not account for children included in a, but not in b or c or provide the range of days beyond the 3rd birthday when eligibility was determined and the reasons for delays.</p>	
	<p>Other: On pages 85 through 87 of the SPP, the State described the development of its post-school results data collection system, known as the Iowa Transition Accountability System (I-TAS). Student sampling procedures are described on page 86 of the SPP. An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 14 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR, due by February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Other: The State did not provide the information required under indicator 15C. On page 92 of the SPP, Iowa Department of Education (IDE) indicated that it reviews complaint investigations and hearing resolution findings to ascertain noncompliance. However, there is no indication from the complaint data provided whether or not noncompliance was identified through a review of complaint data.</p>	<p>The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>