

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

Part B Indicator Measurement Table¹

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State data source and measurement.</p> <p>Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.</p>	<p><i>If State uses 618 data sampling is not allowed.</i> States must use State-level graduation data.</p> <p>A State must provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The calculation used to determine graduation rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. Measurement for youth with disabilities should be the same measurement as for all youth. If not, indicate the difference and explain why there is a difference.
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State data source and measurement.</p> <p>Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.</p>	<p><i>If State uses 618 data sampling is not allowed.</i> States must use State-level dropout data.</p> <p>A State must provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 why. • The calculation used to determine dropout rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. Measurement for youth with disabilities should be the same measurement as for all youth. If not, indicate the difference and explain why there is a

¹ Monitoring Priorities, indicators, and measurements included on the *Part B Indicator Measurement Table* are to be used to populate designated sections of the SPP and APR Templates. Populated templates can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		difference.
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size 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>Data Source:</p> <p>Data source is assessment data collected for purposes of determining AYP. Participation and performance data to be taken from data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served); Table 6 (Section 618) is to be attached to this APR.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Participation rate =</p> <p>a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;</p> <p>b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);</p> <p>c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);</p> <p>d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and</p> <p>e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).</p> <p>Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.</p> <p>Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate =</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should use the same assessments used for reporting under NCLB.</p> <p>States should report the percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives by content area (across all grades) and overall (across grades and content area), and comply with NCLB requirements that a district must meet AYP targets in both content areas to be counted as having made overall AYP.</p> <p>States must attach Table 6 of their 618 submission. Participation and proficiency calculations in this APR report must report participation and proficiency rates by content area for each of the grades shown in Table 6.</p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>States are encouraged to present their APR information in summary tables and include multiple years of data for comparison purposes.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;</p> <p>b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by(a)] times 100);</p> <p>c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);</p> <p>d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100); and</p> <p>e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).</p> <p>Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.</p> <p>Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected for reporting under section 618. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing rates for children with disabilities to rates for nondisabled within a district or by comparing among LEAs for children with disabilities in the State.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States must use the data that were reported for Table 5, in Section A, Column 3B. Table 5 can be found at https://www.ideadata.org/documents.asp#collection .</p> <p>Describe the results of the State's examination of data, 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 disabilities, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The States examination must include one of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among local educational agencies within the State, or

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))	<p>having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the rates for nondisabled children within the agencies. <p>In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.</p> <p>If discrepancies occurred, describe how the State education 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 this requirement.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p> <p>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p>
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected for reporting under section 618</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	(Annual Report of Children Served). Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.	and compare the results to their target.
7. Percent of preschool children 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: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# 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 the (# 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 the (# 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	<p><i>Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>In presenting their results, States should provide their criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been scored as a 6 or 7 on the COSF.</p> <p>In addition, States should list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this Indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COSF.</p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):</p> <p>a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children</p>	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</p> <p>a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>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 the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children</p>	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p>	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling of parents to receive the survey is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>States may wish to utilize information/surveys developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) or the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO). States must submit a copy of any survey used for this indicator.</p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</p>		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data for all children with disabilities.</p> <p>The data analyzed must be the same data reported to OSEP on the <i>Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child</i></p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.</p>	<p><i>Count</i>). Tables for the child count (Table 1) of the Annual Report of Children Served can be found at https://www.ideadata.org/documents.asp#collection.</p> <p>States should consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionality to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to IDEAdata@westat.com or phoning 1-888-819-7024. Describe the method(s) used to determine disproportionality in the cell labeled <i>Baseline/Trend Data</i>.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>If the State has previously identified significant disproportionality, describe how the State addressed the disproportionality, including review of policies, procedures and practices and revisions, as appropriate.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under</p>	<p><i>Sampling from State’s 618 data is not allowed.</i></p> <p>Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has previously identified a problem, or if a State has reason to believe that there are issues with other disability categories (i.e., through written complaints, due process filings, etc.), then the State should explore the remaining disability categories as necessary.</p> <p>The data analyzed must be the same data reported to OSEP on the <i>Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count)</i>. Tables for the child count (Table 1) of the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	618(d), etc.	<p>Annual Report of Children Served can be found at https://www.ideadata.org/documents.asp#collection.</p> <p>States should consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionality to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to IDEAdata@westat.com or phoning 1-888-819-7024. Describe the method(s) used to determine disproportionality in the cell labeled <i>Baseline/Trend Data</i>.</p> <p>Targets must be 0%.</p> <p>If the State has previously identified significant disproportionality, describe how the State addressed the disproportionality, including review of policies, procedures and practices and revisions, as appropriate.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received. b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline). c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established 	<p><i>When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.</i></p> <p>This indicator is referring to “initial” eligibility determination.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	<p>timeline).</p> <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.</p>	
Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition		
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.</p> <p>b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.</p> <p>c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.</p> <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.</p> <p>Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b - d)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated,</p>	<p><i>When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.</i></p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.	
<p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data source.</p> <p>Measurement: 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) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP. (See <u>General Instructions</u> page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>Address all youth who left school including those who graduated, dropped out, aged out, etc. Describe how the above leavers are included in the sample.</p> <p>Data must be collected annually between April and September, inclusive. States must include students who completed school during the prior school year, who dropped out during the prior school year or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year.</p> <p>A State must provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrative that defines competitive employment, including whether the work is full-time (35 or more hours per week) or part-time (less than 35 hours per week). OSEP encourages States to use the Rehabilitation Act definition of competitive employment which reads: <i>Competitive employment</i> means work- (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part-time basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>performed by individuals who are not disabled. (Authority: Sections 7(11) and 12(c) of the Act; 29 U.S.C. 705(11) and 709(c)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A narrative that defines postsecondary school, including: (a) type of school, education, or training; and (b) whether enrollment is full- or part-time. Describe what constitutes full-time enrollment.
Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision		
<p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data to be taken from State monitoring, complaints, hearings and other general supervision system components. Indicate the number of agencies monitored using different components of the State’s general supervision system.</p> <p>Measurement:</p> <p>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> # of findings of noncompliance. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.</p>	<p><i>States must describe the process for selecting LEAs for monitoring.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>States should reflect monitoring data collected through the components of the State’s general supervision system, including on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits, data reviews, complaints, due process hearings, etc.</p> <p>Areas of noncompliance should be grouped by monitoring priority areas and other topical areas. The State should describe the topical areas.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p>	<p>Data Source:</p> <p>Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p>Measurement:</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA</p>

Part B – SPP /APR (2)

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.	level. Complete Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 and submit a copy of completed table with the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) APR due February 2, 2009. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0677 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100%.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> <p>Complete Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 and submit a copy of completed table with the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) APR due February 2, 2009. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0677 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>A target of 100% for this indicator may not be appropriate for all States. In looking at data on other forms of alternate dispute resolution, the consensus among practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		<p>consistent with national mediation success rate data. However, a higher resolution session target may be appropriate for some States.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> <p>Complete Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 and submit a copy of completed table with the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) APR due February 2, 2009. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0677 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: Data collected on Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 (<i>Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>).</p> <p>Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.</p>	<p><i>Sampling is not allowed.</i></p> <p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, the State must develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR.</p> <p>A target of 100% for this indicator may not be appropriate for all States. The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. However, a higher mediation target may be appropriate for some States.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> <p>Complete Table 7 of Information Collection 1820-0677 and submit a copy of completed table with the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) APR due February 2, 2009. An electronic copy of Information Collection 1820-0677 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		.html
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Data Source: State selected data sources, including data from State data system, assessment system, as well as technical assistance and monitoring systems.</p> <p>Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met). 	<p>States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.</p> <p>Targets must be 100% for timeliness and accuracy.</p> <p>States are not required to report data at the LEA level.</p> <p>To help determine if data are reported in an accurate manner, States are encouraged to reference <i>Data Accuracy: Critical Elements for Review of SPPs</i>. This document can be found at http://www.rfcnetwork.org/content/view/248/358/</p>