# 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 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |  |