## Essential Elements

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicator Description:** |
| 4A. 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 individualized education programs (IEPs). |
| **Measurement:[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| 4A. Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100. Include state’s definition of significant discrepancy. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Describe the results of the examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, use data from 2016–17) including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs. |
| **Target Setting:** This is a results indicator. Describe the process your state uses to engage stakeholders and set targets. |
|  |
| [**GRADS360°**](https://osep.grads360.org/#program) **Reporting Information:** Describe login information, location of manual, etc. |
|   |
| **Data Stewards**: Provide titles and names, contact information, department, and any notes on persons responsible for collections, validation, and submission. If there are multiple parties responsible or involved in the process, list them all. |
|  |
| **Data Source Description:** Provide a short description of the database or data system used to process data for this indicator. Consider connecting to 618 data protocol for description of data. |
| State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the state.**ED*Facts* files:** FS006—Children with Disabilities Suspensions/Expulsions FS002—Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age FS089—Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early ChildhoodIf comparing to children without disabilities, define data source for general education counts. |
|  |
| **State Collection and Submission Schedule:** Provide a list of dates necessary for this data collection, including when the data collection period opens, when data are due from the local education agencies (LEAs), and when assigned staff pull the data after the collection closes. |
|  |

## Processes

|  |
| --- |
| **Collection:** Provide detailed information about the origin and collection of the data, including titles of persons responsible. Sampling from state’s 618 data is not allowed. |
|  |
| **Data Validation:** Describe the data cleaning processes and any other processes your state uses to ensure high-quality data. |
|  |
| **Data Analysis:[[2]](#footnote-2)** Describe the process for data analysis. |
| If the state has established a minimum n-size requirement, the state may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that state-established n-size. If the state used a minimum n-size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.In the description, specify which method the state used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies. For 4a, provide the actual numbers used in the calculation and if significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the state education agency and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local education agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements. |
|  |
| **Response to OSEP-Required Actions:** Describe the procedures for reviewing Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) feedback. Following the release of the OSEP determination, indicate who reviews OSEP feedback and how assigned staff make the plan to address concerns and create a response. |
|  |
| **Internal Approval Process:** Describe any internal approval processes (e.g., who must sign off, timelines). |
|  |
| **Submission:** Describe process for entering the data and analyses into [GRADS360°](https://osep.grads360.org/#program). Include information about the person authorized to certify the final report. |
|  |
| **Clarification:[[3]](#footnote-3)** Describe how your state responds to OSEP’s requests for clarification. |
|  |
| **Data Governance:** Describe the process for reviewing potential or actual changes to the data collection and associated requirements. |
|  |
| **Public Reporting:** Describe the process and format for publicly reporting the performance of each LEA against the target of the state’s SPP/APR data. Note where your state posts the state education agency (SEA) and LEA SPP/APR data. |
|  |

1. **Measurement:** Part B Indicator Measurement Table 2018, for FFY 2016 submission. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. **Data Analysis:** Review data year to year, looking for patterns statewide and within LEAs, outliers, whether targets are met or not met, and slippage. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. **Clarification:** OSEP generally sends clarification requests to states about 60 days postsubmission. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)