Essential Elements

|  |
| --- |
| Indicator Description:  |
| 4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with individualized education programs (IEPs); and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. |
| Measurement:[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| 4B. Percent = [(# of districts that meet the state-established n-size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the state that meet the state-established n-size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100. 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. Describe state’s definition of significant discrepancy. Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the state-established n- size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.  |
| Target Setting: This is a compliance indicator. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2015), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. |
| Target must be 0%. |
| [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, analysis, 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 your state uses 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. |
|  |
| Data Validation:Describe the data cleaning processes and any other processes your state used to ensure high-quality data. |
|  |
| Data Analysis:[[2]](#footnote-3) Describe the process for data analysis.  |
| Describe the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of districts in which policies, procedures, or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.Describe the state’s process when discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with related requirements and how the state ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.  |
|  |
| Response to OSEP-Required Actions: Describe the procedures for reviewing 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. |
|  |
| Report on Correction of Identified Noncompliance: Decribe the databases, sources, and persons responsible for conducting the verification of correction reported in the previous State Performance Plan Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). |
|  |
| 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-4) Describe the process for responding to OSEP’s requests for clarification. |
|  |
| Data Governance: Describe the process for reviewing potential or actual future 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-2)
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-3)
3. **Clarification:** OSEP generally sends Clarification requests to states about 60 days postsubmission. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)