



# Interactive Institutes 2018

BUILDING A CULTURE OF  
HIGH-QUALITY PART B DATA

#ii18

February 21–22, 2018

Orlando, FL

March 7–8, 2018

Austin, TX

## Developing Guiding Questions and Identifying Next Steps

For each of the potential areas of analysis listed with the scenarios below, identify guiding questions that a state might consider to address the issue or potential improvements that a state could make in response to the issue.

**Scenario 1:** *The exiting data includes counts (including zero counts) in the category “Received a Certificate” for age 14, but the state did not report the category/age combination on the SSS-IDEA.*

Area of analysis	Potential questions or improvements
Data system	
Internal processes, communication, or other systemic issues	
Impacts of training	
Impacts of policy changes	
Unusual circumstances that may have impacted data	
Support for LEAs	



# Interactive Institutes 2018

BUILDING A CULTURE OF  
HIGH-QUALITY PART B DATA

#ii18

February 21–22, 2018

Orlando, FL

March 7–8, 2018

Austin, TX

**Scenario 2:** *The state received the following comment from OSEP on the IDEA Data Quality Report:*

*The count submitted of children reported disciplined, by discipline method (suspension/expulsion) (C006) for:*

- *Category Set A disability category (2817)*
- *Category Set B race/ethnicity category (3970)*
- *Category Set C gender (3970)*
- *Category Set D LEP status (3970)*
- *Subtotal of discipline method, removal length (3970)*

*are not equal.*

Area of analysis	Potential questions or improvements
Data system	
Internal processes, communication, or other systemic issues	
Impacts of training	
Impacts of policy changes	
Unusual circumstances that may have impacted data	
Support for LEAs	



# Interactive Institutes 2018

BUILDING A CULTURE OF  
HIGH-QUALITY PART B DATA

#ii18

February 21–22, 2018

Orlando, FL

March 7–8, 2018

Austin, TX

**Scenario 3:** *The state had a large year-to-year increase in the number of not highly qualified teachers for students ages 6 to 21. Closer inspection uncovered that two districts accounted for 67% of the difference. These districts provided the same FTE for both highly qualified and not highly qualified.*

Area of analysis	Potential questions or improvements
Data system	
Internal processes, communication, or other systemic issues	
Impacts of training	
Impacts of policy changes	
Unusual circumstances that may have impacted data	
Support for LEAs	



# Interactive Institutes 2018

BUILDING A CULTURE OF  
HIGH-QUALITY PART B DATA

#ii18

February 21–22, 2018

Orlando, FL

March 7–8, 2018

Austin, TX

**Scenario 4:** *In reviewing the Year to Year Report, the state noticed substantial fluctuations in dropouts from one year to the next. The state noted that LEAs are required to input the exit date for a student in both the online IEP and the statewide student information system. Often, it is not the same person in the LEA who is doing the data entry in each system. How might the state use this information?*

Area of analysis	Potential questions or improvements
Data system	
Internal processes, communication, or other systemic issues	
Impacts of training	
Impacts of policy changes	
Unusual circumstances that may have impacted data	
Support for LEAs	