

Activity: Evaluating SPP/APR Example Narratives

Example 1: Correction of Noncompliance for Indicator 11

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

If noncompliance is identified, the state requires school districts to submit evidence that they corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA or EIS program. After reviewing these records, the state notifies school districts if there is still noncompliance that needs to be addressed. Noncompliance is addressed based on OSEP's 09-02 Memo.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

If noncompliance is identified, the state requires school districts to submit evidence that they corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA or EIS program. After reviewing these records, the state notifies school districts if there is still noncompliance that needs to be addressed. The state will conduct additional reviews of student records to determine if school districts have additional noncompliance. School districts will submit this information through the state monitoring platform with information about when parents provided consent, when evaluations were completed, and when eligibility was determined. If the state finds noncompliance, school districts will be required to submit additional student records for review. Noncompliance is addressed based on OSEP's 09-02 Memo.

Example 2: Slippage Statement for Indicator 11

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

From FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, the percent of children evaluated within 60 days of parental consent dropped by 7.23 percentage points. There are several factors that contributed to this, most notably the impact COVID-19 had on LEAs. Based on analysis of the reasons for delay, approximately 68% of the reasons were related to COVID-19, specifically scheduling challenges due to illness; schools closing and moving to virtual instruction due to COVID-19 outbreaks; and lack of evaluators due to staffing shortages brought on by COVID-19. Additionally, the three largest LEAs reported the highest amount of noncompliance (59.41% of noncompliant records were in these three LEAs) and cited that staffing shortages and challenges with getting access to students to conduct evaluations caused the majority (71.42%) of the delays. These three largest LEAs comprised 41.26% of the total records reported for this Indicator. The increased records with noncompliance in the three largest LEAs and the impact of COVID-19 related challenges experienced by LEAs across the state likely contributed to this slippage.

Example 3: Resetting Baselines and Setting Targets for Indicator 14

(The state reset the baselines in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.)

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline
A	2020
A	19.45%
B	2020
B	34.83%
C	2020
C	51.77%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.45%	18.25%	18.55%	18.85%	19.05%	19.35%
Target B >=	34.83%	32.15%	33.15%	34.15%	35.15%	36.15%
Target C >=	51.77%	50.50%	51.75%	53.00%	54.25%	55.50%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Targets were based on stakeholder feedback. Stakeholders felt that the targets for A should be smaller increases than the targets for B and C.