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SPP/APR Overview
What Is the SPP/APR?

• The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) requires each state to develop a State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) that evaluates the state’s efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the IDEA and describes how the state will improve its implementation.

• The SPP/APRs include indicators that measure child and family outcomes and other indicators that measure compliance with the requirements of IDEA.
How Is the SPP/APR Used?

- For states: OSEP uses the SPP/APR to issue annual determinations of state performance in one of four categories
  - Meets Requirements
  - Needs Assistance
  - Needs Intervention
  - Needs Substantial Intervention

- For LEAs: States use the SPP/APR to
  - Issue LEA determinations (using same four determination categories above)
  - Report on the progress of each LEA against the targets of the state
Structure of the SPP/APR

• **Introduction**
  – Executive summary (optional)
  – Number of LEAs
  – General supervision system
  – Technical assistance system
  – Professional development system
  – Stakeholder involvement
  – Reporting to the public

• **SPP/APR Indicators 1–16**
  – Historical data
  – Targets
  – Stakeholder engagement
  – Reporting period data

• **State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)**
  – Section A: Data Analysis
  – Section B: Implementation, Analysis, and Evaluation
  – Section C: Stakeholder Engagement
SPP/APR Indicators

- **Indicator 1**: Graduation
- **Indicator 2**: Dropout
- **Indicator 3**: Assessment
- **Indicator 4**: Suspension and Expulsion*
- **Indicator 5**: Educational Environments
- **Indicator 6**: Preschool Environments
- **Indicator 7**: Preschool Outcomes
- **Indicator 8**: Parent Involvement
- **Indicator 9**: Disproportionate Representation

- **Indicator 10**: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
- **Indicator 11**: Child Find
- **Indicator 12**: Early Childhood Transition
- **Indicator 13**: Secondary Transition
- **Indicator 14**: Post-School Outcomes
- **Indicator 15**: Resolution Sessions
- **Indicator 16**: Mediation
- **Indicator 17**: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

*Indicator 4 has two measures. 4A is a results indicator; 4B is a compliance indicator.*
Key SPP/APR Requirements and Tips
Targets

• Results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17)
  – States set targets
  – Targets should reflect improvement over baseline data in the final year of the package, aside from the following instances
    ▪ Indicator 3A – If the baseline data in the final year of the package is at least 95%
    ▪ Indicators 15 and 16 – No specific threshold and may be set in a range
  – For Indicator 17, states can set a growth target
Targets (cont.)

• Compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)
  – OSEP sets targets
  – Targets are either 0% or 100%

• Stakeholder engagement
  – Engage stakeholders in
    ▪ Setting targets for results indicators
    ▪ Analyzing data
    ▪ Identifying improvement strategies
    ▪ Evaluating progress
  – When considering revising targets, states should engage stakeholders
Group Discussion
Setting Targets—Do’s and Don’ts

Do

• Review longitudinal data to inform target setting
• Verify the year of data the state is using for indicators (e.g., Indicators 1, 2, and 4 are lagged 1 year)
• Ensure the final year’s target reflects improvement over the baseline*
• Establish targets that are both rigorous and achievable

Don’t

• Change targets without stakeholder input
• Leave targets blank in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) SPP/APR tool
• Establish targets that are unattainable (e.g., setting target for Indicator 5A at 100%)

*Excluding Indicators 3A (if target is at or above 95 percent), 15, and 16
Baselines

• Can use as a measuring stick to measure improvement or progress and establish targets
• Should update when there is a change that affects comparability of data, particularly related to
  – Data source
  – Methodology
• Must explain changes to baselines
Group Discussion
Setting Baselines—Do’s and Don’ts

Do

• Revise baselines when there are changes to data sources and methodologies
• Clearly articulate the reason for the baseline change
• Ensure targets are aligned so that results indicator targets show improvement over baselines in the final year of package*

Don’t

• Change baselines arbitrarily without clear, justifiable reasons
• Select baselines at random
• Create baselines

*Excluding Indicators 3A (if target is at or above 95 percent), 15, and 16
Slippage

• Worsening of data from previous year to the current reporting year and failure to meet the indicator target
• Slippage thresholds established based on the size of the indicator percentage
  – Large percentage (10% or above): worsening of more than 1 percentage point and failure to meet target
  – Small percentage (less than 10%): worsening of more than 0.1 percentage point and failure to meet target
Group Discussion
Responding to Slippage—Do’s and Don’ts

Do

• Demonstrate that the state has thoroughly reviewed data to determine reason for slippage
• Provide details about how the state investigated the data and its findings
• Address the question being asked—nothing less, nothing more

Don’t

• Use generic language about how the state reviews data broadly
• Write how the state will review data to determine the cause of slippage
• Describe steps the state will take to address the slippage instead of the reasons for slippage
Public Reporting

• Demonstrate how the state reported data to the public on the following
  – SPP/APR introduction
    ▪ How and where the state reported to the public on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the prior year’s SPP/APR within 120 days of submission of the prior SPP/APR (34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A))
    ▪ Description of where a complete copy of the prior year’s SPP/APR is available on the website
  – Indicator 3
    ▪ Link to the page(s) where the state provides public reports of assessment results for the current reporting period
Public Reporting (cont.)

• For public reporting of assessment data, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), states must
  – Report with the same frequency and detail as it reports on students without disabilities (e.g., state level, LEA level, school level)
  – Number of students with disabilities participating in regular assessments (with and without accommodations)
  – Number of students with disabilities participating in alternate assessments
  – Performance results of students with disabilities on regular assessments and alternate assessments compared with the achievement of all students, including students with disabilities
Group Discussion
Public Reporting—Do’s and Don’ts

Do

• Ensure that all required data are accurate and posted on the state website within the requisite timeline
• Verify the links to data are live and correctly entered into the SPP/APR for the correct reporting periods
• Compile assessment data with the appropriate level of detail and necessary data elements
• Suppress data as appropriate, based on state policies

Don’t

• Assume state report cards or accountability systems will have the necessary level of detail to meet assessment public reporting requirements
• Copy and paste the links provided in prior SPP/APR submissions without verifying if they are still accurate
• Publicly report data with small cell or n-sizes or in any way that could violate confidentiality
Correction of Noncompliance

- LEAs must complete correction of noncompliance for compliance indicators (and Indicator 4A) with findings of noncompliance
- States complete two “prongs” of review to verify correction of noncompliance
  - Prong 1: Describe how the state verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected
  - Prong 2: Describe how the state verified that the source of the noncompliance is correctly implementing regulatory requirements
- States can report findings of noncompliance at the individual case level (student records) or source level (LEA or educational unit)
Group Discussion
Correction of Noncompliance—Do’s and Don’ts

Do

• Report the state’s completed activities to address individual cases of noncompliance and the source of noncompliance
• Provide language that is specific to the records of noncompliance and/or LEAs with noncompliance
• Articulate correction of noncompliance in accordance with the OSEP Memo 09-02 language

Don’t

• Provide “boilerplate” language of what the state’s processes are for correcting noncompliance are
• Use future tense (e.g., the state will review records to determine compliance)
• Go beyond the question being asked
• Include information about individual cases of noncompliance when verifying whether sources of noncompliance are correctly implementing regulatory requirements, and vice versa
Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias (Indicators 8 and 14)

• Compare response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year
• Analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of responders
• Describe the metric used to ensure representativeness
• Analyze the demographics of those responding, and if they are not representative, describe strategies to ensure future representativeness
Group Discussion
Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias—Do’s and Don’ts

**Do**
- Provide data to analyze responses by subgroups, including race and ethnicity and at least one other demographic
- Apply the metric you used to ensure representativeness
- Include strategies if you determine responses are not representative
- Describe how you identified potential nonresponse bias and steps taken to address nonresponse bias

**Don’t**
- Identify discrepancies that indicate the responses were not representative and then answer “yes” to representativeness
- Fail to address whether the response group was representative
- Omit steps to address potential nonresponse bias even if bias was not identified
Activity: Evaluating SPP/APR Narratives
Resources

- **SPP/APR Resources at A Glance** (IDEA Data Center)
- **SPP/APR Instructions** (OSEP)
- **SPP/APR Measurement Table** (OSEP)
- **Historical SPP/APR and SPP/APR Letters** (OSEP)
Contact Us

• Nancy Johnson, ntjohnson11@gmail.com
• Rachel Wilkinson, rachelwilkinson@westat.com
What actions will you take to commit to being a Data Quality Influencer?
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