

---

## Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

# State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)

Universal Technical Assistance for  
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020-2025

---

**Purpose:** This document provides universal technical assistance (TA) regarding changes made to the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR.

### FFY 2020–2025 Measurement Tables:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/grantees/#SPP-APR,FFY20-25-SPP-APR-Package>

### Data Quality

OSEP will consider the impact of Coronavirus-19 (COVID-19 or pandemic) on the State’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR data. OSEP recognizes that COVID-19 could impact FFY 2020 data collection and data reporting. More specific guidance regarding how States should include information regarding the impact of COVID-19 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, will be provided with the release of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR package in Fall 2021 (or before).

### Baseline

States are permitted to revise baseline data and, when doing so, are required to provide an explanation for the revision (see [SPP/APR instructions](#)). OSEP expects that baseline data would be revised when there is a change in methodology or data source for the indicator that impacts comparability of the data.

### Targets

- States are required to set targets that show improvement over the baseline data for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR. In setting its targets for FFY 2020–2025, the State must describe its stakeholder input process.

- If, based on prior year’s performance, a State decides to establish FFY 2020–2025 targets that are lower than the targets that were established from FFY 2016–2019, OSEP encourages the State to provide information regarding this decision in its narrative.
- Generally, targets are not approvable if they do not show improvement over baseline; however, there have been specific instances where OSEP has allowed States to set targets that do not reflect improvement over baseline.
- It is OSEP’s longstanding position that in the case of natural environments, resolution sessions, and mediations targets should not drive a specific outcome. More specifically, in the case of natural environments an individualized family service plan (IFSP) team, including the parent, must make service setting decisions based on individual child needs, not on meeting a target. Similarly, targets should not influence agreements made within mediation and resolution sessions. Additionally, regarding participation rates for children with IEPs, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires that States annually measure the achievement of not less than 95 percent of SWD who are enrolled in public schools. To align with this requirement, when reporting participation data under Indicator 3A, a State’s end target may be set at 95% even if there is no improvement over baseline. Therefore, the FFY 2025 target does not need to show improvement over baseline in the following instances:
  - Indicator C-2 – If the FFY2025 target is at least 95%;
  - Indicator B-3A – If the FFY2025 target is at least 95%;
  - Indicator B-15/C-9 – No specific threshold; and
  - Indicator B-16/C-10 – No specific threshold.
- For Indicators B17 and C11, the end targets must show improvement over baseline. Also, a State may set a growth target for the State systemic improvement plan (SSIP), but must discuss this decision with their OSEP State Lead as it has implications for how data are reported in the SPP/APR reporting tool.
- OSEP expects that States meet the stakeholder involvement requirement based on the [FFY 2020 SPP/APR Instructions and Measurement Table](#). For FFY 2020–2025, States’ description of stakeholder input on the States’ targets in the SPP/APR must include:
  - The number of parent members and a description of how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council/State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress;
  - Description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities and their families;
  - The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress; and

- The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

## **Representativeness**

Race/ethnicity was included as a required demographic category because OSEP believes that it will increase high quality data necessary for States to improve outcomes. High quality data means data that accurately reflect the infants, toddlers, and youth with disabilities served. Therefore, OSEP believes that it is necessary to include race/ethnicity and at least one other category from the those listed in the [Measurement Table](#). OSEP acknowledges that some States may have to update surveys and data collection tools to include the required data elements; therefore, OSEP delayed the requirement to report on the specific demographic categories to February 2023 for Part B programs and February 2024 for Part C programs so States will have time to make any necessary adjustments.

## **Sampling**

For indicators that permit sampling, the State must include in its report on the performance of local educational agency/early intervention service (LEAs/EIS) programs the most recently-available performance data on each LEA/EIS program and the date that the data were obtained. If a State is using sampling for one or more indicators, the State must sample on the performance of each LEA/EIS program on each of those indicators at least once during the period of FFY 2020–2025. Further, if a State is using sampling, the State must collect data from a representative sample of LEAs/EIS programs each year in order to report on State performance annually.

If a State will use its currently-approved sampling plan and only change the years for which it is used, the State can provide an assurance to this effect with the FFY 2020 APR, due February 1, 2022. If a State proposes to use a sampling plan that was not previously used/approved or will revise its current sampling plan, the State must submit the sampling plan for approval (see [SPP/APR Instructions](#)).

## **Indicators B1/B2**

Indicator 1 measures the number of youth with IEPs exiting special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The data source for this indicator is the same data reported under Section 618 of IDEA, using the definitions in file specification FS009. These data will be preloaded in the reporting tool and are consistent with the data used to calculate the exiting elements of the RDA matrix.

OSEP has made a technical edit to the FFY 2020–2025 Part B [Measurement Table](#) to remove the word "died" from Indicator B2.

## **Indicator B4**

The FFY 2020–2025 [Measurement Table](#) does not offer flexibility to include in-school-suspensions. Consistent with OSEP’s longstanding position, States must use out-of-school suspensions as the data source for this indicator.

<https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2020-07/Final-IDC-EquityComparisonFlyer-OSEP.pdf>

## **Indicator B6**

The final target for Indicator B6C (receiving special education services in the home) should decrease from the baseline established in FFY 2020. OSEP expects that most children would attend a regular early childhood program and receive the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; therefore, the targets for the “home” category in most States should decrease over time.

As defined in the file specifications for the Child Count and Educational Environments data, “home” is the “unduplicated total who received the majority of their special education and related services in the principal residence of the child’s family or caregivers, and who attended neither a Regular Early Childhood Program nor a Special Education Program provided in a separate class, separate school, or residential facility. Include children who receive special education and related services both at home and in some other location, if they are receiving the majority of their services in the home. The term caregiver includes babysitters.”

<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/data-documentation-files/part-b/child-count-and-educational-environment/idea-partb-childcountandedenvironment-2018-19.pdf>

Federal statute requires that, "In general, as a part of the State performance plan described under paragraph (1), each State shall establish measurable and rigorous targets for the indicators established under the priority areas described in subsection (a)(3)." (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

OSEP understands the unique challenges presented by the pandemic and will work with the incoming administration to identify opportunities for flexibility.

## **Indicator B9/Indicator B10**

A technical edit will be made to the instructions for Indicators 9 and 10 to reflect that racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all school aged children (including five-year-old children enrolled in kindergarten) should be included in the data for these indicators.

## **Indicators B17/C11 (SSIP)**

- Beginning with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR due February 1, 2022, States will be required to report Indicator B17/C11 within the SPP/APR reporting tool.

- OSEP will not review FFY 2020 SSIP drafts prior to the February 1, 2022 submission deadline. Beginning with the FFY 2020 submission, States will have the opportunity to utilize the clarification period to receive feedback on OSEP’s initial analysis of Indicators B17/C11. States are encouraged to take advantage of the support TA centers provide in reviewing draft SPP/APR prior to submission on February 1. Further, OSEP will be reviewing Indicators B17/C11 along with all other SPP/APR indicators. If questions or concerns are identified, States will be notified in OSEP’s response and it will be addressed during the State’s clarification call. Additionally, States will have the opportunity to discuss OSEP’s Response, and Required Actions, as applicable, during their determination call.
- If a State is continuing to implement its current SSIP and has not identified a new State identified Measurable Results (SiMR), then information previously reported does not need to be reported in the FFY 2020 submission.
- States may continue the SiMR that was identified in the previous SPP/APR. In the FFY 2020 report due February 1, 2022, all States must set targets for FFY 2020–2025. Alternatively, States may choose to change their SiMR. States that change their SiMR for the FFY 2020–2025 SPP/APR must provide baseline data (in addition to FFY 2020–2025 targets). Although States are encouraged to discuss changes to their SSIP with their OSEP State Lead, and work with their TA providers, States will not be required to obtain pre-approval from OSEP in order to change their SiMR. Questions or concerns about a State’s new or revised SiMR will be documented in OSEP Response and addressed with the State during the SPP/APR clarification period.

States that choose to change the SiMR focus should provide details in the FFY 2020 report regarding the system analysis, data analysis, and stakeholder engagement activities that were conducted to reach the decision to change. Additionally, States should report on the infrastructure improvement activities/coherent improvement activities from previous SSIP activities that it will leverage to improve the new outcome or result area as well as any newly identified system components and evidence-based practices.

- Child and student outcomes as discussed in the context of the SiMR must be a child- or student-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing reading proficiency for students with disabilities, knowledge and skills for infants and toddlers), or a cluster of results that improve child outcomes. For Part B States, the most common SiMRs address child-specific results such performance on assessments (Indicator B-3). For Part C, the most common SiMRs address early childhood outcomes (Indicator C-3). Not all results indicators are approvable for the SiMR but may be incorporated into Indicator B17/C11 as an outcome for a specific improvement strategy that ultimately has impact on the SiMR.
  - SiMRs based on the following results indicators would not be acceptable, stand-alone SiMRs:
    - For Part C:
      - Indicator 2 – natural environments
      - Indicators 5 and 6 – child find

- Indicators 9 and 10 – resolution sessions and mediation
- For Part B:
  - Indicator 2 – dropout
  - Indicator 4 – suspension/expulsion
  - Indicators 5 and 6 – LRE
  - Indicator 8 – parent involvement
  - Indicators 15 and 16 – resolution sessions and mediation