

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Iowa**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The State estimates that the reliability of some indicator data submitted in this FFY 2020 SPP/APR is impacted by COVID-19. Indicators with data from 2019-2020 (Indicators 1, 2, and 4A/4B) may be less reliable due to the start of the pandemic at the end of that school year. Other indicators from 2020-2021 that are likely showing the impacts of COVID-19 with a decrease in outcome data are Indicators 3, 11, 12, and 14. Reviews were suspended at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year with the need for schools and districts to focus their efforts on returning students to school, but were later resumed.

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

327

#### General Supervision System:

##### The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Since 1974, Iowa has been divided into intermediate agencies (Area Education Agencies) to provide specialized services. The AEAs were created in order to provide equity in the provision of programs and services across counties or merged areas. One key difference between Iowa's AEA system and intermediate units in other states is that Iowa's AEAs are mandatory. It is also mandatory that each local school district be assigned to an area education agency that will provide the services the school district needs. The AEAs carry special education general supervision and compliance responsibilities and the charge to provide the services needed by the local school districts. Their primary role is provision of special education support services to individuals under the age of 21 years requiring special education and related services, media services to all children through grade 12, and other educational services to pupils and education staff. The AEAs also provide the system used to locate and identify students suspected of having disabilities and provide the personnel to conduct evaluation activities in collaboration with LEAs. Iowa's Part B general supervision system is a partnership between the Iowa Department of Education (IDE) and the AEAs and is multifaceted. The components include: 1) support practices that improve educational outcomes for students (described under technical assistance and professional development); 2) use of multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance within one year; and 3) mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and enforce compliance.

**Dispute Resolution.** The State uses a system for dispute resolution including both informal and formal mechanisms. Resolution Facilitation is a way to resolve differences instead of, or before use of, formal proceedings provided by the State. The SEA has written procedures for resolving any complaint, including a complaint filed by an organization or individual from another state. The SEA has widely disseminated these procedures to parents and other interested individuals, including the Iowa Parent Training and Information Center, Disability Rights Iowa, independent living centers and other appropriate entities. A mediator assists in resolving differences between parents, schools and private service providers. Mediation is voluntary on the part of all parties and conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation can occur at any time, even prior to the filing of a due process hearing request. Whenever a due process hearing request is filed, the parties involved in the dispute have an opportunity for an impartial due process hearing.

**Monitoring - Area Education Agencies (intermediate agencies).** The SEA annually conducts desk audits for each AEA and follows up with accreditation visits if determined necessary. During this visit AEA documents are reviewed and internal (AEA staff) and external (Staff from school districts served by the AEA) interviews are held that relate to the agency's five-year Comprehensive Improvement Plan and the services the agency provides in accordance with the eight required standards and one optional standard outlined in Chapter 72 of the Iowa Code. During the accreditation process, the special education services the agency provides are a part of each of the eight required standards. A targeted interview is held with special education staff; topics discussed during this interview include the agency's State Performance Plan indicator data, LEA (district) special education procedural compliance data, the AEA's general supervision responsibilities and other AEA data used by the Iowa Department of Education to make the accreditation determination regarding the agency.

**Monitoring - Local Education Agencies (school districts).** The SEA annually conducts desk audits for each LEA and follows up with accreditation visits if determined necessary. The Accreditation Site Visit process may include Iowa Chapter 12, Equity, Special Education and Title Programs; dependent upon findings of the desk audit. During a site review, the district provides requested information, including additional information as a result of the Iowa Department of Education's procedural compliance review related to the implementation of IDEA. Data are collected through a Web-based tool, with a report developed for each district to identify individual student noncompliance and whether or not the issues are identified as a system level issue. If noncompliance is identified as a system level issue, the district must respond to the corrective action identified within the report. The AEA then monitors and verifies the correction of individual noncompliance as well as the implementation of the required corrective action. Individual student noncompliance and system level corrective action are to be fully implemented as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification. After the AEA verifies that all corrections have been made, documentation is submitted to the SEA.

During the site visit, multiple interviews take place on a variety of topics. The on-site visit allows for conversations to occur regarding student performance and implementation of the special education practices in the district. Interview groups include community partners, parents, teachers, school board, district administrators, and support staff. One of the interviews allows for district staff to be interviewed with a specific focus on special education practices and district level special education data. A comprehensive report written to the district identifies strengths, recommendations and any noncompliance in all of the areas reviewed during the site visit. Any special education noncompliance identified during the site visit must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from date of notification.

#### Technical Assistance System:

##### The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Iowa's technical assistance system as distinguished by OSEP, is intricately entwined with Iowa's professional development system. This section, therefore, describes the structures which support technical assistance and professional development. The activities and strategies used for technical assistance and professional development are explained within the description of Iowa's professional development system.

Iowa's technical assistance system has long been a partnership between the IDE, AEAs and LEAs. The processes and structures for providing technical

assistance, however, have changed over time. Successful implementation of Iowa's State Personnel Grant and Systemic Improvement Plan have resulted in the establishment of new structures for the provision of technical assistance. Primary among them are the IDEA Support Network and SDI Literacy Network. These new structures have provided leverage in four ways: (1) Alignment of resources, including fiscal and personnel, focused on one priority (literacy) across priority areas that have the greatest success across children/youth (work teams); (2) Collaboration of the DE, AEA and LEAs; (3) Identification/development of evidence-based frameworks, strategies and programs by experts in the field regardless of affiliation or location; and (4) Intentional statewide scaling based on implementation science.

#### **Professional Development System:**

##### **The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

Using the structures described above, Iowa employs its own model of professional development, established from evidence based practices of professional learning. The Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) is an integrated cycle of planning, ongoing implementation and evaluation. It emphasizes ongoing support and feedback for the learning and application of new skills. Iowa Administrative Code requires each district's professional development plans to meet the following standards:

1. Align with the Iowa teaching standards and criteria;
2. Deliver research-based instructional strategies aligned with the student achievement goals established by the district;
3. Deliver professional development training and learning opportunities that are targeted at improvement of instruction and designed with the following components:
  - a. Student achievement data and analysis, comparisons of sub-group data which includes students with disabilities;
  - b. Theory about learning and instruction;
  - c. Classroom demonstration and practice;
  - d. Classroom observation and self-reflection;
  - e. Teacher collaboration and study of teacher implementation; and
  - f. Integration of instructional technology, if applicable;
4. Include an evaluation component of professional development that measures improvement in instructional practice and its impact on student learning; and
5. Support the professional development needs of district certified staff responsible for instruction.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

##### **The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

106

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

##### **Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

As the primary vehicle for parent member involvement on SEAP, parent members of the panel were involved in every aspect of stakeholder engagement. Alongside the other panel members (see previous section for member representation), parents analyzed the historical data of each indicator, provided their input on which set of targets would be ambitious yet achievable in six years, and were engaged in the discussions regarding improvement strategies to reach the proposed targets.

Additional feedback was gathered from parents who participated in discussions of improvement strategies during several public webinars hosted by the Iowa Department of Education. Each of these webinars reviewed the proposed targets of indicators related to the topic, as voted on by the previously mentioned stakeholder groups, and featured a panel discussion by members of state agencies, LEA and AEA staff, community organizations, and parents. The webinar topics included: Secondary Transition, Preschool, Specially Designed Instruction (component of SSIP), Early Childhood Outcomes (Birth to 5), and Personnel Shortages. Webinar participants, which included parents, were able to ask questions and participate in the conversation during the webinar, as well as provide more detailed feedback and input on improvement strategies in an online survey.

A separate webinar opportunity was co-hosted by the IDE and Access for Special Kids (ASK) Resource Parent Center, a statewide special education advocacy organization. This webinar was specifically for parents and families of students in special education, and provided the opportunity for small group discussion of three potential priority areas, as well as an online survey to share additional information and suggestions. The three priority areas cut across several indicators and were: 1) communication and partnerships, 2) provision of services and supports by personnel with knowledge of content and unique needs of the child, and 3) application of specially designed instruction framework to other content areas. This statewide plan (SPP) addresses prioritized improvement activities based on parent member input.

Evaluation of progress will be conducted by comparing annual indicator outcomes to the targets set. Additional evaluation methods may be added as improvement strategies are implemented and progress data are shared with stakeholders.

### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Activities for increasing capacity of parent involvement included the IDE hosted webinars, opportunities to provide feedback in both in-person meetings and online surveys, and facilitated small group discussions with ASK Resource Center. Registration for the webinars was shared broadly across the state to all educator networks to increase the diversity of parents participating by geographic region. Demographic data was collected during webinar registration and in survey responses, and will be analyzed for which groups of parents may be identified for needing additional canvassing strategies in the future.

### **Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

April – May 2021: IDE staff begin planning stakeholder engagement process and activities.

May – August 2021: IDE staff prepare historical data and additional data for indicators, develop individual indicator target setting worksheets, develop surveys for input.

August – November 2021: IDE staff meet monthly with SEAP and the AEA special education directors to review potential targets and discuss improvement strategies.

November – December 2021: Proposed final indicator targets are shared with webinar participants during public webinars hosted by the IDE.

February 2022: Targets are submitted as part of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Evaluating progress: Progress of the state's performance on the indicators is shared annually with SEAP, which is involved in any needed revisions to targets or baseline data.

### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

**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.**

February 2022: Targets are submitted as part of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

June 2022: The final submitted FFY 2020 SPP/APR is posted on the IDE's public special education reporting website, which is the end result of the target setting, data analysis, development of improvement strategies and evaluation.

Ongoing: Progress of the state's performance on the indicators is shared annually with SEAP, which is involved in any needed revisions to targets or baseline data. Outcome data are also shared with various stakeholder groups that meet throughout the year, such as the AEA Special Education Directors and State Special Education team, SEAP, and various state work groups for discussion of evaluating progress. Current and future efforts also include public posting of state and LEA data profiles on the public reporting page.

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

A link to Iowa's current SPP/APR on the IDEA website is located on IDE's website under the Special Education Public Reporting section: <https://educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/special-education-public-reporting>.

When made available, the FFY 2020 SPP/APR will be posted on the same IDE website in the same location.

Performance of AEs and LEAs on appropriate indicators are posted annually by June 1. District and AEA profiles are posted at: <https://educateiowa.gov/pk-12/special-education/special-education-public-reporting>

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Iowa has received technical assistance from a number of OSEP funded centers as well as private entities throughout the reporting period. OSEP funded centers that have provided technical assistance to Iowa include Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), IDEA Data Center (IDC), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), and National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT). The later two centers are most relevant to Iowa's needs to meet requirements. Actions taken as the result of technical assistance will focus on the work with NCSI and NTACT.

Iowa has participated in technical assistance provided by NCSI in a number of ways, including participation in general webinars, accessing resources collected and posted by NCSI and direct technical support provided by NCSI staff. Iowa staff attended the Learning Collaboratives event hosted by NCSI but had not committed to joining one by the time that COVID hit. Iowa has not, therefore, yet joined one of the three primary Learning Collaboratives sponsored by NCSI. The State Director of Special Education has, however, joined the State Education Agency Leadership (SEAL) Collaborative. Additionally, she meets monthly with NCSI staff in individual consultation. Finally, an NCSI staff person meets at least monthly with the Iowa Education Consultant who leads Iowa's monitoring and general supervision responsibilities. The primary outcome of this work is that Iowa is refining its processes for identifying districts in need of additional support. The intent of this work is to better identify districts in need of support and connect them with evidence based strategies that directly address their needs. For example, Iowa's SSIP and SPDG are focused on specially designed early literacy. The evidence based practices from this work and the infrastructure supports for coaching will be available to those districts identified through Iowa's improved identification strategies which were refined with assistance from NCSI.

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data<sup>1</sup>

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 80.43%        |

| FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 93.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data      | 76.99% | 69.51% | 74.25% | 76.51% | 83.12% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 83.37% | 85.42% | 86.57% | 87.72% | 88.87% | 90.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

### Prepopulated Data

<sup>1</sup> Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data  |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)     | 2,861 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0     |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)                           | 0     |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)                              | 78    |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)                                  | 618   |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 2,861  | 3,557   | 83.12%        | 83.37%          | 80.43%        | N/A    | N/A      |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

Graduation in the State of Iowa is defined as (1) a student who has received a regular diploma who completed all unmodified district graduation requirements in the standard number of four years, or (2) students receiving a regular diploma from an alternative placement within the district, or who have had the requirements modified in accordance with a disability. Students who have finished the high school program but did not earn a diploma, or earned a certificate of attendance or other credential in lieu of a diploma are not considered graduates.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2020 due to the change in data source. Stakeholders agreed with the need to change the baseline.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2012          | 21.49%        |

| FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 20.50% | 20.00% | 19.50% | 19.00% | 19.00% |
| Data      | 18.05% | 19.79% | 19.34% | 19.02% | 18.79% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 18.52% | 18.28% | 18.02% | 17.77% | 17.51% | 17.25% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has

organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data  |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)     | 2,861 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0     |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)                           | 0     |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)                              | 78    |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)                                  | 618   |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 618   | 3,557   | 18.79%        | 18.52%          | 17.37%        | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definitions used for dropouts include students who satisfy one or more of the following conditions:

- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled as of Count Day of the current year or
- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and left the school before the previous summer and
- Has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district-approved educational program; and
- Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - transfer to another public school district, private school, or state or district-approved educational program,
  - temporary school-recognized absence for suspension or illness,
  - death, or
  - move out of the state or leave the country

A student who has left the regular program to attend an adult program designed to earn a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) or an adult high school diploma administered by a community college is considered a dropout. However, a student who enrolls in an alternative school or alternative program administered by a public school district is not considered a dropout.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A     | Grade 4    | 2018          | 98.55%        |
| Reading | B     | Grade 8    | 2018          | 97.60%        |
| Reading | C     | Grade HS   | 2018          | 95.48%        |
| Math    | A     | Grade 4    | 2018          | 98.55%        |
| Math    | B     | Grade 8    | 2018          | 97.63%        |
| Math    | C     | Grade HS   | 2018          | 95.54%        |

#### Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >=  | Grade 4    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >=  | Grade 8    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >=  | Grade HS   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | A >=  | Grade 4    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | B >=  | Grade 8    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | C >=  | Grade HS   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| Group   | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs*  | 5,296   | 5,363   | 13,450   |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations        | 1,350   | 1,263   | 3,063    |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations           | 3,572   | 3,503   | 8,173    |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 277     | 263     | 839      |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| Group   | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs*  | 5,312   | 5,422   | 13,704   |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations        | 1,353   | 1,279   | 3,111    |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations           | 3,585   | 3,533   | 8,302    |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 279     | 258     | 826      |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 5,199                                      | 5,296                        |               | 95.00%          | 98.17%        | Met target | N/A      |

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| B     | Grade 8    | 5,029                                      | 5,363                        |               | 95.00%          | 93.77%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 12,075                                     | 13,450                       |               | 95.00%          | 89.78%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 5,217                                      | 5,312                        |               | 95.00%          | 98.21%        | Met target          | N/A      |
| B     | Grade 8    | 5,070                                      | 5,422                        |               | 95.00%          | 93.51%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 12,239                                     | 13,704                       |               | 95.00%          | 89.31%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Assessment results are publicly reported for the state and for all LEAs on the Iowa School Performance Profiles, as a Learning Measure under "Participation":

<https://www.iaschoolperformance.gov/ECP/StateDistrictSchool/StateDetails?DetailType=Participation&DataDisplayType=Accountability&y=2021>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline for participation when under the former Indicator 3B was the FFY 2018 year. The baseline for participation under 3A has also been set to FFY 2018 due to that being the first year of the state's standard assessment, and was established due to Indicator 3A being new.

**3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3A - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A     | Grade 4    | 2018          | 25.14%        |
| Reading | B     | Grade 8    | 2018          | 18.15%        |
| Reading | C     | Grade HS   | 2018          | 17.60%        |
| Math    | A     | Grade 4    | 2018          | 33.42%        |
| Math    | B     | Grade 8    | 2018          | 23.18%        |
| Math    | C     | Grade HS   | 2018          | 13.23%        |

### Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >=  | Grade 4    | 28.41% | 28.63% | 28.79% | 28.95% | 29.11% | 29.27% |
| Reading | B >=  | Grade 8    | 24.28% | 24.55% | 24.82% | 25.09% | 25.36% | 25.63% |
| Reading | C >=  | Grade HS   | 20.40% | 20.60% | 20.80% | 21.00% | 21.20% | 21.40% |
| Math    | A >=  | Grade 4    | 30.04% | 30.76% | 31.44% | 32.12% | 32.80% | 33.50% |
| Math    | B >=  | Grade 8    | 24.03% | 24.50% | 24.97% | 25.44% | 25.91% | 26.38% |
| Math    | C >=  | Grade HS   | 13.36% | 14.36% | 15.36% | 16.36% | 17.36% | 18.36% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency,

institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations. Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set. The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment     | 4,922   | 4,766   | 11,236   |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 386     | 298     | 667      |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 1,011   | 857     | 1,791    |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment     | 4,938   | 4,812   | 11,413   |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 410     | 307     | 456      |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 1,073   | 850     | 1,164    |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 1,397  | 4,922  |               | 28.41%          | 28.38%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| B     | Grade 8    | 1,155  | 4,766  |               | 24.28%          | 24.23%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 2,458  | 11,236   |               | 20.40%          | 21.88%        | Met target          | N/A      |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 1,483  | 4,938  |               | 30.04%          | 30.03%        | Did not meet target | N/A      |
| B     | Grade 8    | 1,157  | 4,812  |               | 24.03%          | 24.04%        | Met target          | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 1,620  | 11,413   |               | 13.36%          | 14.19%        | Met target          | N/A      |

### **Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

### **Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Assessment results are publicly reported for the state and for all LEAs on the Iowa School Performance Profiles, as a Learning Measure under "Proficiency": <https://www.iaschoolperformance.gov/ECP/StateDistrictSchool/StateDetails?DetailType=Proficiency&y=2021>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2018 due to that being the first year of the state's standard assessment, to which stakeholders agreed.

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A     | Grade 4    | 2020          | 44.04%        |
| Reading | B     | Grade 8    | 2020          | 19.01%        |
| Reading | C     | Grade HS   | 2020          | 12.04%        |
| Math    | A     | Grade 4    | 2020          | 16.13%        |
| Math    | B     | Grade 8    | 2020          | 9.30%         |
| Math    | C     | Grade HS   | 2020          | 11.02%        |

#### Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >=  | Grade 4    | 44.04% | 44.64% | 45.24% | 45.84% | 46.44% | 47.04% |
| Reading | B >=  | Grade 8    | 19.01% | 19.61% | 20.21% | 20.81% | 21.41% | 22.01% |
| Reading | C >=  | Grade HS   | 14.39% | 14.99% | 15.59% | 16.19% | 16.79% | 17.39% |
| Math    | A >=  | Grade 4    | 16.13% | 16.73% | 17.33% | 17.93% | 18.53% | 19.13% |
| Math    | B >=  | Grade 8    | 9.30%  | 9.90%  | 10.50% | 11.10% | 11.70% | 12.30% |
| Math    | C >=  | Grade HS   | 11.02% | 11.62% | 12.22% | 12.82% | 13.42% | 14.02% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations. Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set. The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 277     | 263     | 839      |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient            | 122     | 50      | 101      |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 279     | 258     | 826      |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient            | 45      | 24      | 91       |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 122  | 277  |               | 44.04%          | 44.04%        | N/A    | N/A      |

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| B     | Grade 8    | 50   | 263  |               | 19.01%          | 19.01%        | N/A    | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 101  | 839  |               | 14.39%          | 12.04%        | N/A    | N/A      |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 45   | 279  |               | 16.13%          | 16.13%        | N/A    | N/A      |
| B     | Grade 8    | 24   | 258  |               | 9.30%           | 9.30%         | N/A    | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 91   | 826  |               | 11.02%          | 11.02%        | N/A    | N/A      |

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

Assessment results are publicly reported for the state and for all LEAs on the Iowa School Performance Profiles, as an Additional Measure under "Alternate Assessment Results": <https://www.iaschoolperformance.gov/ECP/StateDistrictSchool/StateDetails?DetailType=DLM&k=0&y=2021>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2020 due to the indicator measure being new for FFY 2020. Stakeholders agreed with the need to set the baseline at FFY 2020.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

| Subject | Group | Group Name | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------|-------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reading | A     | Grade 4    | 2020          | 44.55         |
| Reading | B     | Grade 8    | 2020          | 48.79         |
| Reading | C     | Grade HS   | 2020          | 51.26         |
| Math    | A     | Grade 4    | 2020          | 36.39         |
| Math    | B     | Grade 8    | 2020          | 43.48         |
| Math    | C     | Grade HS   | 2020          | 48.18         |

#### Targets

| Subject | Group | Group Name | 2020  | 2021  | 2022  | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Reading | A <=  | Grade 4    | 44.55 | 43.99 | 43.83 | 43.67 | 43.51 | 43.35 |
| Reading | B <=  | Grade 8    | 48.79 | 48.31 | 48.04 | 47.77 | 47.50 | 47.23 |
| Reading | C <=  | Grade HS   | 51.26 | 51.06 | 50.86 | 50.66 | 50.46 | 50.26 |
| Math    | A <=  | Grade 4    | 36.39 | 35.52 | 34.84 | 34.16 | 33.48 | 32.80 |
| Math    | B <=  | Grade 8    | 43.59 | 43.12 | 42.65 | 42.18 | 41.71 | 41.24 |
| Math    | C <=  | Grade HS   | 50.54 | 49.54 | 48.54 | 47.54 | 46.54 | 45.54 |

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with

relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

#### FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

#### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment                 | 34,187  | 37,339  | 105,581  |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment           | 4,922   | 4,766   | 11,236   |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level       | 23,816  | 26,349  | 75,277   |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 1,011   | 857     | 1,791    |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 386     | 298     | 667      |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 1,011   | 857     | 1,791    |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

#### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment                 | 34,225  | 37,494  | 106,480  |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment           | 4,938   | 4,812   | 11,413   |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level       | 21,610  | 24,503  | 65,007   |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 1,073   | 850     | 1,164    |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 410     | 307     | 456      |

|   |       |     |       |
|---|-------|-----|-------|
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,073 | 850 | 1,164 |
|---|-------|-----|-------|

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 28.38%  | 72.62%  |               | 44.55           | 44.24         | N/A    | N/A      |
| B     | Grade 8    | 24.23%  | 72.86%  |               | 48.79           | 48.63         | N/A    | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 21.88%  | 72.99%  |               | 51.26           | 51.12         | N/A    | N/A      |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 30.03%  | 66.28%  |               | 36.39           | 36.24         | N/A    | N/A      |
| B     | Grade 8    | 24.04%  | 67.62%  |               | 43.59           | 43.57         | N/A    | N/A      |
| C     | Grade HS   | 14.19%  | 62.14%  |               | 50.54           | 47.95         | N/A    | N/A      |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2020 due to 3D being a new indicator measure. Stakeholders agreed with the need to set the baseline.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

The State has established baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

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.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that 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 how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 1.36%         |

| FFY       | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.30% | 1.30% | 1.30% |
| Data      | 1.81% | 1.52% | 1.61% | 0.92% | 1.54% |

**Targets**

| FFY       | 2020  | 2021  | 2022  | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 1.55% | 1.32% | 1.25% | 1.19% | 1.13% | 1.06% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations. Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set. The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa’s Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

5

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy | Number of LEAs that met the State’s minimum n/cell size | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 5  | 322   | 1.54%         | 1.55%           | 1.55%         | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The State’s definition of significant discrepancy is a rate ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any single year of data. The State uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation. The district’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days is compared to the State’s rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days. The district’s rate is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP removed for 10 or more days by the total number of students with an IEP in the district. The calculation for the State’s rate is the same. The rate ratio used to determine significant discrepancy is the district’s rate divided by the State’s rate. In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an “administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons,” with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as “a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons,” (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006). A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP to be considered in the analysis. The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a rate ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board policies, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary. Reviews were suspended in the fall of 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, but were later resumed.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7                                    | 6   | 1  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

A review of subsequent data indicated that three of the five districts reduced their risk rate ratio of a discrepancy to an extent that it was not significant. One district reduced the likelihood of a discrepancy of suspension/expulsion risk rate ratio from 7.7 to 5.2. While the remaining district saw a slight increase from 4.48 to 4.91, Department staff had ongoing interactions with the two remaining districts throughout the year and found no evidence of noncompliance in practices, policies and procedures. Therefore, all five districts were found to correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance).

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

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected. The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

A review of subsequent data indicated that three of the five districts reduced their risk rate ratio of a discrepancy to an extent that it was not significant. One district reduced the likelihood of a discrepancy of suspension/expulsion risk rate ratio from 7.7 to 5.2. While the remaining district saw a slight increase from 4.48 to 4.91, Department staff had ongoing interactions with the two remaining districts throughout the year and found no evidence of noncompliance in practices, policies and procedures. Therefore, all five districts were found to correctly implement the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance).

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

**4A - Required Actions**

The State did not report that noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) was corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

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.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that 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 how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2009          | 0.55%         |

| FFY    | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    |
| Data   | 1.51% | 0.61% | 0.32% | 0.62% | 0.31% |

**Targets**

| FFY    | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

7

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity | Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0  | 0  | 320   | 0.31%         | 0%              | 0.00%         | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The State's definition of significant discrepancy is a rate ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any one or more race/ethnicity category for any single year of data. The State uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation. The district's rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days is compared to the State's rate of suspensions or expulsions totaling 10 or more days for each race/ethnicity category. The district's rate is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity removed for 10 or more days by the total number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity in the district. The calculation for the State's rate is the same. The rate ratio used to determine significant discrepancy is the district's rate divided by the State's rate for each race/ethnicity category. In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an "administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons," with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as "a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons," (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2006). A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP in any one or more race/ethnicity categories to be considered in the analysis. The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a rate ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

No districts were identified as significantly discrepant; therefore, no review was necessary and the State did not conduct any additional review.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

When necessary, districts identified as significantly discrepant participate in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions: (1) A review and examination of district discipline data, (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices, (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board policies, etc.), (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1                                    | 1   | 0  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In addition to reviewing any corrective action plans, the State completed a desk audit, using the State data system, to verify findings. A final determination of findings was made by the State and a review of the corrective action plan was conducted to ensure policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

The LEA was required to submit results of the implementation of their corrective action plan to verify the noncompliance has been corrected in future occurrences.

A review of subsequent data from the State's data system for the one district with previous noncompliance revealed no significant discrepancy. The district was found to be correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance).

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

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected.

The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The State verified that each LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by reviewing updated information in the State data system of a similar nature to the area of noncompliance identified in the original finding.

The State verified, through the State data system and review of the revised policies, procedures and practices that each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected. The State (a) reviewed the revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards of the LEA, (b) reviewed the revised practices for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA, and (c) reviewed the revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2005 of the LEA.

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A    | 2020     | Target >= | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| A    | 73.51%   | Data      | 65.63% | 66.15% | 69.44% | 70.61% | 71.71% |
| B    | 2020     | Target <= | 8.50%  | 8.00%  | 7.50%  | 7.00%  | 7.00%  |
| B    | 6.72%    | Data      | 8.90%  | 8.45%  | 8.14%  | 7.78%  | 7.22%  |
| C    | 2020     | Target <= | 2.80%  | 2.70%  | 2.60%  | 2.50%  | 2.50%  |
| C    | 1.19%    | Data      | 1.57%  | 1.51%  | 1.52%  | 1.37%  | 1.23%  |

### Targets

| FFY         | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 72.30% | 73.10% | 75.84% | 76.95% | 79.69% | 80.81% |
| Target B <= | 7.00%  | 6.50%  | 6.50%  | 6.00%  | 6.00%  | 6.00%  |
| Target C <= | 1.70%  | 1.60%  | 1.50%  | 1.40%  | 1.30%  | 1.15%  |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**Prepopulated Data**

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data   |
|---|------------|--|--------|
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21  | 65,010 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day   | 47,792 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,369  |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools                              | 561    |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities                        | 171    |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements                 | 42     |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| Education Environments  | Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day  | 47,792   | 65,010  | 71.71%        | 72.30%          | 73.51%        | N/A    | N/A      |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day  | 4,369  | 65,010  | 7.22%         | 7.00%           | 6.72%         | N/A    | N/A      |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 774  | 65,010  | 1.23%         | 1.70%           | 1.19%         | N/A    | N/A      |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2020 due to the change in measurement. Stakeholders agreed with the need to change the baseline.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **5 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

| Part | FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A    | Target >= | 42.00% | 43.00% | 44.00% | 45.00% | 45.00% |
| A    | Data      | 33.73% | 33.58% | 32.61% | 32.36% | 33.23% |
| B    | Target <= | 7.00%  | 6.00%  | 5.00%  | 4.00%  | 4.00%  |
| B    | Data      | 6.54%  | 6.42%  | 5.68%  | 5.32%  | 3.64%  |

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**Targets**

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

**Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)**

| Part | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|------|---------------|---------------|
| A    | 2020          | 47.49%        |
| B    | 2020          | 4.41%         |
| C    | 2020          | 1.68%         |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

| FFY         | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 47.49% | 50.01% | 52.53% | 55.05% | 57.57% | 60.10% |
| Target B <= | 4.41%  | 4.12%  | 3.84%  | 3.55%  | 3.27%  | 2.98%  |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

| FFY         | 2020  | 2021  | 2022  | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target C <= | 1.68% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 1.75% | 1.50% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| Description  | 3     | 4     | 5   | 3 through 5 - Total |
|--|-------|-------|-----|---------------------|
| Total number of children with IEPs   | 1,379 | 2,240 | 666 | 4,285               |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 750   | 1,057 | 228 | 2,035               |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class  | 76    | 83    | 24  | 183                 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school   | 2     | 3     | 0   | 5                   |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility  | 0     | 1     | 0   | 1                   |
| c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home  | 28    | 31    | 13  | 72                  |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

| Preschool Environments   | Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 2,035  | 4,285   | 33.23%        | 47.49%          | 47.49%        | N/A    | N/A      |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility   | 189  | 4,285   | 3.64%         | 4.41%           | 4.41%         | N/A    | N/A      |
| C. Home  | 72   | 4,285   |               | 1.68%           | 1.68%         | N/A    | N/A      |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The baseline has been set to FFY 2020 due to the change in measurement. Stakeholders agreed with the need to change the baseline.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1   | 2008     | Target >= | 64.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% |
| A1   | 66.25%   | Data      | 62.96% | 63.03% | 65.06% | 55.92% | 59.01% |
| A2   | 2008     | Target >= | 57.00% | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |

|    |        |           |        |        |        |        |        |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 53.54% | Data      | 55.84% | 56.72% | 57.60% | 54.33% | 50.95% |
| B1 | 2008   | Target >= | 72.00% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| B1 | 73.97% | Data      | 72.11% | 71.77% | 70.83% | 65.00% | 63.56% |
| B2 | 2008   | Target >= | 31.50% | 33.00% | 34.50% | 36.00% | 36.00% |
| B2 | 34.92% | Data      | 32.01% | 32.23% | 37.21% | 33.17% | 25.74% |
| C1 | 2008   | Target >= | 62.00% | 63.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% | 65.00% |
| C1 | 56.67% | Data      | 58.79% | 59.19% | 59.27% | 58.22% | 56.49% |
| C2 | 2008   | Target >= | 64.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 67.00% |
| C2 | 54.98% | Data      | 60.13% | 62.80% | 63.24% | 61.29% | 59.74% |

### Targets

| FFY          | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 >= | 61.50% | 62.50% | 63.50% | 64.50% | 65.50% | 66.50% |
| Target A2 >= | 50.00% | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 55.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.50% | 73.00% | 74.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 33.00% | 33.50% | 34.00% | 34.50% | 35.00% | 35.50% |
| Target C1 >= | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% | 62.00% | 62.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% | 62.00% | 62.50% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

#### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

2,511

#### Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

| Outcome A Progress Category   | Number of children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning   | 21                 | 0.84%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 616                | 24.53%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 472                | 18.80%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 583                | 23.22%                 |

| Outcome A Progress Category   | Number of children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 819                | 32.62%                 |

| Outcome A   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 1,055     | 1,692       | 59.01%        | 61.50%          | 62.35%        | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>   | 1,402     | 2,511       | 50.95%        | 50.00%          | 55.83%        | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| Outcome B Progress Category   | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning   | 23                 | 0.92%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 717                | 28.55%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 923                | 36.76%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 707                | 28.16%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 141                | 5.62%                  |

| Outcome B   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 1,630     | 2,370       | 63.56%        | 68.00%          | 68.78%        | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>   | 848       | 2,511       | 25.74%        | 33.00%          | 33.77%        | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| Outcome C Progress Category                           | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 37                 | 1.47%                  |

| Outcome C Progress Category   | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 583                | 23.22%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 365                | 14.54%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 597                | 23.78%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 929                | 37.00%                 |

| Outcome C  | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.<br><i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 962       | 1,582       | 56.49%        | 60.00%          | 60.81%        | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.<br><i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>   | 1,526     | 2,511       | 59.74%        | 60.00%          | 60.77%        | Met target | No Slippage |

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

| Sampling Question  | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO       |

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) is a systematic process to determine children's functioning compared to same-aged peers and to determine progress in skills and behaviors in the three ECO areas (A, B, C). The ECO data are gathered upon determination of eligibility for special education services. The ECO entry data for the Comparison to Peers are collected as part of the development of the Initial IEP and the ECO exit data for Comparison to Peers and Progress data are collected when the child exits or no longer receives early childhood special education services. These data are reported on the ECO Summary form that was adapted from the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) form developed by the National Early Child Outcomes Center. A child's Comparison to Peers rating of his or her skills and behaviors are determined based on a triangulation of multiple sources of data gathered using methods such as Record review, Interview, Observation, and Test/Assessment (RIOT). The IEP Team determines the methods for collecting data based upon the unique needs of the child. The test/assessment instruments may include adaptive and developmental scales and curriculum-based, criterion-referenced and norm-referenced assessments. The ECO Summary form is used to summarize the child's skills and behaviors in comparison to the functioning expected for the chronological age of the child as well as the child's progress prior to exiting early childhood special education services in each of the three ECO areas. The ECO Summary form summarizes the analysis of a child's progress based on a triangulation of data such as progress on IEP goals and levels of independence in performance, regardless of the areas addressed on a child's IEP. The ECO Summary form includes a seven-level outcome rating scale that summarizes each child's level of functioning in each of the three ECO areas in relation to same-aged peers. A rating of six or seven indicates the ECO area was achieved at an age-appropriate level across a variety of settings and situations, and a rating of one through five indicates the child's functioning was below age-appropriate skills expected of a child his or her age. Additionally, the IEP Team determines if a child has progressed or acquired new skills or behaviors in each of the three ECO areas and documents the child's progress by responding to a "yes/no" question on the ECO Summary form.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## **7 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also 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 parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| Question  | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO       |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**Historical Data**

| Group      | Baseline | FFY          | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Preschool  | 2016     | Target<br>>= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 91.00% |
| Preschool  | 87.71%   | Data         | 80.64% | 87.71% | 89.07% | 90.95% |        |
| School age | 2016     | Target<br>>= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 86.00% |
| School age | 84.92%   | Data         | 76.13% | 84.92% | 85.49% | 85.65% |        |

**Targets**

| FFY            | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A<br>>= | 88.64% | 89.80% | 90.96% | 92.12% | 93.38% | 94.44% |
| Target B<br>>= | 85.68% | 87.54% | 89.40% | 91.26% | 93.12% | 95.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

| Group      | Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities | Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status     | Slippage |
|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------|
| Preschool  | 320  | 361  |               | 88.64%          | 88.64%        | Met target | N/A      |
| School age | 3,142  | 3,667  |               | 85.68%          | 85.68%        | Met target | N/A      |

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

69,295

Percentage of respondent parents

5.81%

**Response Rate**

| FFY           | 2019 | 2020  |
|---------------|------|-------|
| Response Rate |      | 5.81% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

For the last several years, the state has conducted a census of all parents of students in special education in the spring of each year. With the state's new special education data system, the state is considering changing to a sample of parents of students at key points – such as transitions from Part C to Part B or secondary transition. We anticipate that a sample approach would increase the overall response rate, and that using the parent portal of the IEP data system would greatly improve the representativeness of the children for which parents are responding.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

The survey used to collect Indicator 8 data is sent to all parents of students in preschool through grade 12, including those with IEPs and those without IEPs. Parents of students with IEPs made up 12.0% of the total survey responses, which is just under the statewide IEP identification rate of 12.7% of students in preschool-grade 12. In this regard, there is no response bias between parents of students with IEPs and those without.

**Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

The data of the children for which parents were responding were not entirely representative of the demographics of the children in the special education population. An analysis of the data indicates that by race or ethnicity, parents responding on behalf of children of African American and Hispanic or Latino are underrepresented in the results, while parents responding on behalf of children who are White are overrepresented. All other races/ethnicities were within +/-3 percentage points in the difference between the responses and the population, the state's chosen metric for determining representation.

See the data below:

**Population of Children by Race/Ethnicity**

Asian: 1.37%  
African American: 9.43%  
Hispanic or Latino: 11.56%  
Two or More Races: 5.51%  
American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.59%  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.30%  
White 71.18%

**Responses of Parents on Behalf of Children by Race/Ethnicity:**

Asian: 1.32%  
African American: 2.46%  
Hispanic or Latino: 4.07%  
Two or More Races: 6.70%  
American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.55%  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.07%  
White: 84.83%

By age, parents responding on behalf of students ages 6-21 were within -1.40 to 2.14 percentage points of the population for all ages. For parents responding on behalf of children ages 3-5, parents responding on behalf of children age 4 were overrepresented, and on behalf of children age 5 were underrepresented.

Based on the analysis described above, the state recognizes the need to improve representativeness of parents responding on behalf of children in the following areas:

- \*Students that are African American and Hispanic or Latino
- \*Parents of students that are age 3 and age 5 (likely those that are in preschool).

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

For the last several years, the state has conducted a census of all parents of students in special education in the spring of each year. With the state's new special education data system, the state is considering changing to a sample of parents of students at key points – such as transitions from Part C to Part B or secondary transition. We anticipate that a sample approach would increase the overall response rate, and that using the parent portal of the IEP data system would greatly improve the representativeness of the children for which parents are responding.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The State compares the demographics of the children for which the parents respond to the demographics of the state's population of children in special education. If the percent of the survey responses are within +/- 3 percentage points of the population, it is considered representative. Differences that are greater are considered over- or underrepresentative, respectively.

| Sampling Question  | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO       |

| Survey Question                        | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Was a survey used?                     | YES      |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO       |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey.  |          |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 0.00%         |

| FFY    | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    |
| Data   | 0.00% | 0.31% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

#### Targets

| FFY    | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

10

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 2  | 0   | 317   | 0.00%         | 0%              | 0.00%         | N/A    | N/A      |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The State's definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio that exceeds the threshold of 3.50 for any one or more race/ethnicity category for any single year of data. The district's risk for a race/ethnicity category is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity by the total number of students with an IEP of each race/ethnicity in the district. The district's risk for a non-race/ethnicity category is calculated by dividing by the number of students with an IEP of each non-race/ethnicity by the total number of students with an IEP of each non-race/ethnicity in the district. The risk ratio used to determine disproportionate representation is the district's risk for a race/ethnicity divided by the district's risk for each non-race/ethnicity category.

A district must have a minimum of 10 students with an IEP in any one or more race/ethnicity categories to be considered in the analysis.

The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts with a risk ratio of greater than or equal to 3.50, (2) dividing the number of districts with disproportionate representation by the total number of districts in the state that met the minimum n of ten, and (3) multiplying by 100.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Iowa has developed a Disproportionality Review that is conducted at the district level. The process involves a formal review in which the district examines and evaluates the following areas:

Section 1: Review of Data,

Section 2: Review of Related Issues and Practices,

Section 3: Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices,

Section 4: Technical Assistance/Professional Development, and

Section 5: Results/Findings.

The data review consists of the district examining its collection and use of data, (e.g., how data are disaggregated, analyzed, used to make decisions, guide practices, etc.). The review of related issues and practices consists of the examination of key areas that have been identified as impacting the area of disproportionality (e.g., utilization of universal screening; administrator/personnel understanding of special education procedures and requirements regarding referral, evaluation, identification, placement, discipline, LRE; attempts to rule out exclusionary factors during the evaluation process, etc.)

The process also consists of a formal review of policies, procedures and practices regarding the following areas: child find, parent participation, general education interventions, systematic problem-solving process, progress monitoring and data collection, determination of eligibility and evaluations/reevaluations. In addition, the district describes the technical assistance and/or professional development that is being conducted at the district and in districts regarding and/or related to disproportionality (e.g., differentiation of instruction, progress monitoring, cultural competency, understanding racial biases, etc.).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline was set to FFY 2020 due to the change in the measurement.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 0                                    | 0   | 0  | 0                                      |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Iowa is noncategorical and does not collect disability category data.

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 10 - Required Actions

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 87.31%        |

| FFY    | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 99.30% | 99.28% | 99.00% | 98.48% | 89.00% |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

| (a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received | (b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline) | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 11,566  | 11,167   | 89.00%        | 100%            | 96.55%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

399

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Range of days beyond 60-day timeline when meeting was held: 1-242

Reasons for delays:

Child's hospitalization/long-term illness: 5

Natural disaster: 3

No valid reason: 99

Parent failure or refusal: 93

Public health emergency - COVID-19: 199

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Reported data were generated from Iowa's Information Management System. The data reflect all children and youth in Iowa who were evaluated for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel, using the federal definition for 60-day timeline for evaluation (initial evaluations). The data taken from the monitoring system are based on the actual (not an average) number of days. Iowa uses the date of receipt of consent by the public agency, as the date for starting the 60-day calendar for completion of the evaluation. The State uses the date of evaluation as the date for stopping the calendar for calculating the timeline. At all pertinent times, Iowa's definition of 60-day timeline is identical to the federal definition contained in the 2005 IDEA amendments and the 2007 IDEA regulations.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1,038                                | 1,038   | 0  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State used data from the state database (e.g., subsequent data) designed to track special education evaluation and placement data. These data were used to determine the extent to which 60-day timelines were met statewide, and which AEAs were or were not meeting the regulatory requirement of 100% compliance of evaluations completed within a 60-day timeline. The state verified through this follow-up that all AEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

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

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every child for whom consent to evaluate was received subsequently received an evaluation, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the AEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

## **11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The State used data from the state database designed to track special education evaluation and placement data. These data were used to determine the extent to which 60-day timelines were being met statewide, and which AEAs were or were not meeting the regulatory requirement of 100% compliance of evaluations completed within the 60-day timeline. The State continued to emphasize the use of verification reports to help meet the timelines.

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every child for whom consent to evaluate was received subsequently received an evaluation, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the AEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

## **11 - OSEP Response**

### **11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 99.83%        |

| FFY    | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 99.34% | 99.65% | 99.48% | 99.54% | 88.84% |

#### Targets

| FFY    | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.       | 1,156 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 61    |

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.   | 1,017 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.                                 | 11    |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.   | 7     |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0     |

| Measure  | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|--|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 1,017         | 1,077                   | 88.84%        | 100%            | 94.43%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**  
60

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

Days beyond third birthday when eligibility was determined and IEP developed: 1-253

Reasons for delay:

Natural Disaster: 3

Public Health Emergency: 26

No valid reason: 31

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data reported were generated from Iowa's Information Management System. The data reflect all children in Iowa who were referred by Part C prior to age three for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during the current reporting period. The data were entered into the database by trained personnel.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 6                                    | 6   | 0  | 0                                      |

#### FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State used data from the state database (e.g. subsequent data) to determine the extent to which early childhood transition requirements were met in the state, and to determine which AEAs were and were not meeting regulatory requirements of developing and implementing an IEP by the child's third birthday. The State reviewed FFY 2020 data for the 8 AEAs with noncompliant data in FFY 2019. During this review, the State determined that noncompliance was occurring rarely and in isolated cases without any trend. While not at 100%, most were delayed as a result of the public health emergency. As a result of the root cause analyses, the SEA continued to promote the use of verification reports in the state's database that alert AEAs to transition requirements.

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

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that very child served in Part C and referred to Part B subsequently received an evaluation and – if eligible – a fully developed IEP, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b).

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The State used data from the state database to determine the extent to which early childhood transition requirements were being met in the state, and to determine which AEAs were and were not meeting regulatory requirements of developing and implementing an IEP by the child’s third birthday. During the prior reporting period, the State determined that noncompliance was occurring rarely and in isolated cases without any trend. As a result of the root cause analyses, the SEA continued to promote the use of verification reports in the state’s database that alert AEAs to transition requirements. The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that very child served in Part C and referred to Part B subsequently received an evaluation and – if eligible – a fully developed IEP, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each AEA that was performing below 100 percent compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b).

**12 - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining six uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2016          | 61.69%        |

| FFY    | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 94.74% | 61.69% | 63.86% | 65.88% | 68.61% |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition | Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 3,954   | 5,769                                       | 68.61%        | 100%            | 68.54%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

In order to obtain the sample for the current reporting year, IEPs were randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) The State's sampling plan is a three-year cycle for IEP review. During the first year of the cycle, IEPs from all districts in the state are reviewed. Subsequent samples for years two and three of the cycle are drawn for districts found to be outside the universal tier of support. All samples are drawn using the procedure outlined below. IEPs are randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14 and older in districts in the self-assessment year of Iowa's school improvement cycle. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) Sample size is determined using an 80% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10%. The sample is drawn with stringent confidence intervals because of the magnitude of decision-making based on the data. The sample is drawn to ensure representativeness. Responses are later assessed to validate the sample on representativeness by age, race and gender. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category). To meet criteria for Indicator B-13, an IEP must contain all six of the elements listed below. Critical Element 1: Interests and Preferences. Interests and preferences as they relate to post-secondary areas and student invitation to the meeting. Critical Element 2: Transition Assessments. Assessment information listing specific data and the source of the data for each post-secondary area of living, learning and working is sufficient to determine that the post-secondary area was assessed. Critical Element 3: Post-secondary Expectations. A statement for each post-secondary area of living, learning, and working is observable, based on assessment information and projects beyond high school. Critical Element 4: Course of Study. The course of study must project to the student's anticipated end of high school, be based on needs and include: 1) a targeted graduation date; 2) the student's graduation criteria; and 3) any courses or activities the student needs to pursue his/her post-secondary expectations. Critical Element 5: Annual Goals. All goals must support pursuit of the student's post-secondary expectations and be well-written and all areas of post-secondary expectations must have a goal or service / activity or the assessment information must clearly indicate there is no need for services in that post-secondary area. Critical Element 6: Services, supports, and activities. Statements must specifically describe the services, supports and activities necessary to meet the needs identified through the transition assessment. Evidence that adult agencies and community organizations were involved as appropriate must also be present. Data were collected through Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), certified by AEA staff and validated through the ISTAR system. Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of IEPs at a high level of confidence using the procedure described above. A response rate of 100 percent was achieved. Sample data for the reporting period were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities. (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

| Question   | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | YES      |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES      |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator  | 14       |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1,815                                | 1,815   | 0  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement was done by analyzing subsequent data. Districts assigned to the intensive level of support, 50% compliance and below, are required to review a sample of IEPs determined using an 80% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/- 10% during years two and three of the cycle regardless of improved performance. While the State was able to verify correction of all individual noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state review indicated that implementation of specific regulatory requirements occurred in only six of the ninety districts. This is despite corrective action and technical assistance provided by the state. As a result, the State is changing its processes for data collection, identification of district support needs and types of supports provided to districts.

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

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every instance of child-specific noncompliance was subsequently corrected on the IEP, and (b) verifying that each district that was performing below 100% compliance during the prior reporting period is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance occurs in the Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR) monitoring system. First, the district verifies that for each child for whom the transition requirements were not met, all required corrections have been made on the IEP. Then the Area Education Agency (AEA) verifies the same information on the IEP. Child-specific noncompliance is considered "verified" when both steps have been completed. While the State was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

### 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

#### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement was done by analyzing subsequent data in a sample of IEPs subsequent to the time during which the noncompliance was found, but within the one-year correction period. Districts assigned to the intensive level of support, 50% compliance and below, were required to review a sample of IEPs determined using an 80% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10% during years two and three of the cycle regardless of improved performance. While the State was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

The State verified the correction of noncompliance identified during the prior reporting period by (a) verifying that every instance of child-specific noncompliance was subsequently corrected on the IEP, and (b) verifying that each district that was performing below 100% compliance during the prior reporting period was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance occurred in the Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR) monitoring system. First, the district verified that for each child for whom the transition requirements were not met, all required corrections have been made on the IEP. Then the Area Education Agency (AEA) verified the same information on the IEP. While the State was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for prior reporting period, the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the State with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 2 1 1.604]

### 13 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

### 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 1,815 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education =  $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school =  $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment =  $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also 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 youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

**Measure A:** For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

**Measure B:** All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

**Measure C:** All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Measure | Baseline | FFY          | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   |
|---------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A       | 2018     | Target<br>>= | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% |
| A       | 20.17%   | Data         | 28.46% | 18.86% | 18.45% | 20.17% | 17.62% |
| B       | 2018     | Target<br>>= | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% | 72.00% | 72.00% |
| B       | 57.02%   | Data         | 53.94% | 60.55% | 55.17% | 57.02% | 42.88% |
| C       | 2018     | Target<br>>= | 91.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |
| C       | 66.59%   | Data         | 89.46% | 72.69% | 65.82% | 66.59% | 63.57% |

### FFY 2020 Targets

| FFY            | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target<br>A >= | 20.24% | 22.86% | 25.48% | 28.10% | 30.72% | 33.34% |
| Target<br>B >= | 46.57% | 50.26% | 53.95% | 57.64% | 61.33% | 65.00% |
| Target<br>C >= | 67.48% | 71.39% | 75.30% | 79.21% | 83.12% | 87.03% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with

relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census   | 3,986   |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school   | 3,986   |
| Response Rate  | 100.00% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 652     |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 1,098   |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)                         | 17      |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 725     |

| Measure  | Number of respondent youth | Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1)  | 652                        | 3,986  | 17.62%        | 20.24%          | 16.36%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)  | 1,750                      | 3,986  | 42.88%        | 46.57%          | 43.90%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 2,492                      | 3,986  | 63.57%        | 67.48%          | 62.52%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable  |
|------|--|
| A    | The State attributes slippage to annual fluctuations in postsecondary enrollment patterns. The decrease is also reflective of national postsecondary enrollment patterns, which has decreased in the fall of 2020 and the fall of 2021.  |
| C    | The State attributes slippage to annual fluctuations in the data. The decrease is also reflective of employment patterns seen nationally into 2021, with unemployment rates being higher than usual during the first half of the year, still rebounding from the impact of COVID-19. |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

| FFY           | 2019    | 2020    |
|---------------|---------|---------|
| Response Rate | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The State uses administrative data compiled from Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to match to a base file of all students who exited school while on an IEP during the 2019-2020 school year. Rather than a response rate, the State analyzes the data for a match rate to determine what percent of students that exited school are found in the IWD and/or the NSC data files. The last four years have provided an average of 89.3% of students with IEPs that exited school being found in either file, with the current year's match rate of 94.6% included. When the match rate is lower than 70%, the IDE will analyze the data to determine which groups are underrepresented in the outcome data files.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The match rate for the 2019-2020 data is 94.6%. Given that nearly all students in the population were found in either database, it is unlikely there is bias in the small percentage of students that were not found.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The data are exactly representative for the 94.6% of students from the population of students that left school while on an IEP that were matched in the administrative data set.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The metric used to determine representativeness is the match rate between students that left school while on an IEP to the IWD and NSC data files. When the match rate is lower than 70%, the IDE will analyze the data to determine which groups are underrepresented in the outcome data files.

| Sampling Question  | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO       |
| Survey Question    | Yes / No |
| Was a survey used? | NO       |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions  | 3    |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0    |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

#### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 100.00%       |

| FFY | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
|     |      |      |      |      |      |

|           |        |        |        |         |        |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Target >= |        |        |        |         |        |
| Data      | 75.00% | 80.00% | 66.67% | 100.00% | 60.00% |

**Targets**

|            |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>FFY</b> | <b>2020</b> | <b>2021</b> | <b>2022</b> | <b>2023</b> | <b>2024</b> | <b>2025</b> |
| Target >=  |             |             |             |             |             |             |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| <b>3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements</b> | <b>3.1 Number of resolutions sessions</b> | <b>FFY 2019 Data</b> | <b>FFY 2020 Target</b> | <b>FFY 2020 Data</b> | <b>Status</b> | <b>Slippage</b> |
|--|---|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 0  | 3   | 60.00%               |                        | 0.00%                | N/A           | N/A             |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Targets are not required when the number of resolution sessions is less than 10 in a year.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description   | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held   | 18   |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints     | 6    |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 6    |

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations.

Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set.

The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network.

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 74.00%        |

| FFY       | 2015   | 2016   | 2017    | 2018   | 2019   |
|-----------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00%  | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| Data      | 76.47% | 85.00% | 100.00% | 87.50% | 88.89% |

**Targets**

| FFY       | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| 2.1.a.i<br>Mediation<br>agreements<br>related to due<br>process<br>complaints | 2.1.b.i<br>Mediation<br>agreements not<br>related to due<br>process<br>complaints | 2.1 Number of<br>mediations<br>held | FFY 2019<br>Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020<br>Data | Status                 | Slippage |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|
| 6   | 6   | 18                                  | 88.89%           | 75.00%          | 66.67%           | Did not meet<br>target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State attributes slippage to annual changes in mediations held.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

###### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Decrease the percentage of students with IEPs in grades kindergarten through 3rd grade identified as high risk on a literacy assessment.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

Although the SiMR was changed, the focus of the SSIP did not change. The intent of Iowa's SSIP continues to be improving the early literacy skills of students with IEPs. The improvement activities also remain the same as in previous submissions. Ongoing review of district early literacy data as well as the number of districts completing the SDI literacy professional learning opportunities supported the need to continue to focus on early literacy. Feedback from stakeholders for previous APR submissions has been to find a measure that is more sensitive to actual student growth.

#### Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

FastBridge Assessment Specifications  
FastBridge Proficiency Data  
FastBridge Benchmark Data  
FastBridge Percentile Data  
FastBridge Risk Data  
District participation Data  
District fidelity implementation Data  
District FastBridge data by district size (using US Census definitions)

#### Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Literacy assessment and evaluation experts used the above data to identify measures that would be more sensitive to individual student growth. Two options (percentiles and risk level) were then presented to numerous stakeholders including AEA Special Education Directors, SDI Literacy Network, IDEA Support and SEAP. The risk level measure was selected based on the feedback, including the likelihood that more people would understand risk levels than percentiles.

#### Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

For multiple years stakeholders have expressed concern over the State's original SiMR (Increase the percentage of learners with disabilities who are proficient readers by the end of third grade). Concerns expressed primarily focused on the measure's inability to represent an individual's growth in reading that improved their reading ability, but was not large enough to affect the proficiency scales on an assessment. The State sought input from a variety of literacy assessment and evaluation stakeholders on possible changes to the SiMR that would be more sensitive than the previous measure of proficiency. After reviewing historical student data, several possible measures were presented to the State. These measures were then shared with the stakeholder groups described above and a new SiMR was selected.

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset population is a set of students that are attending a district that participated in professional learning in the area of specially designed instruction (SDI) literacy between 2015-2022, have implemented SDI literacy strategies for grades kindergarten through 3rd grade, and have at least 3 or more years of experience with SDI literacy. These are the districts that participated in professional learning during Iowa's first SSIP. The SiMR, however, has been changed to more accurately identify continued progress and sustainability. Students attending districts that fit these criteria, and who have a reading or communication goal, will be tracked over the course of the 2020-2025 SPP/APR period.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1O2tIzBFSS4uChZTDi\\_9yY3Hd3EpO04pD/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1O2tIzBFSS4uChZTDi_9yY3Hd3EpO04pD/view?usp=sharing)

#### Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

#### If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Evaluation data indicated that students on IEPs had better literacy outcomes when taught by teachers who participated in the professional learning and implemented SDI literacy strategies at routine or sustained levels. See Evaluation reports: <https://sites.google.com/a/iowa.gov/iowa-specially-designed-instruction-sdi/data-and-results/spdg-evaluation-results-spotlights?authuser=0>

### Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

**Historical Data**

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 50.56%        |

**Targets**

| FFY      | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target>= | 50.56% | 50.00% | 49.00% | 48.00% | 47.00% | 46.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of IEP students in grades K-3 that are high risk on literacy assessment | Number of IEP students in grades K-3 assessed using literacy assessments | FFY 2019 Data | FFY 2020 Target | FFY 2020 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 818  | 1,618  |               | 50.56%          | 50.56%        | N/A    | N/A      |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

FastBridge literacy screening assessments, early Reading and CMBr English. FastBridge combines Computer Adaptive Tests (CAT) and Curriculum-Based Measures (CBM) to screen students, identify skill gaps, and offer proven recommendations for reading instruction and diagnostic reading interventions. It is based on the research of Dr. Ted Christ and colleagues at the University of Minnesota.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

Literacy assessments are administered in FastBridge. FastBridge reports include indicators of student risk for not reaching learning goals. These are known as benchmarks and include indicators for the following levels:

- Low Risk: likely to meet grade-level goals (41st to 85th Percentiles)
- Some Risk: unlikely to meet grade-level goals without supplemental instructional support (16th -40th percentiles)
- High Risk: very unlikely to meet grade-level goals without intensive instructional support. These risk indicators can be used to identify supports for individual students. (41st to 85th percentiles)

Data is pulled from FastBridge into Iowa's Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) data system. In the MTSS system, students are given risk level categories. For the SiMR, Iowa Department of Education (IDE) staff analyzed student data from the districts identified in the cohort. The numerator is the number of students matching the criteria (IEP, grades K-3) that were identified as High Risk on either the eReading or CMBr assessment in the spring of 2020-2021. The denominator is all students matching the criteria (IEP, K-3) that took the assessment.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

Iowa used an external evaluator for the initial years implementing the SSIP and found the formative evaluation data invaluable. The evaluation reports were used to inform implementation approaches, review progress on short term measures and evaluate effect. As such, Iowa will continue to use the current evaluation plan and is in the process of contracting with an external evaluator for the next six years.

Evaluation reports: <https://sites.google.com/a/iowa.gov/iowa-specially-designed-instruction-sdi/data-and-results/spdg-evaluation-results-spotlights?authuser=0>

Current evaluation plan:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mSdA3W8dDFC35QmOC65G0I9Uzsc6ukLB/edit?usp=sharing&oid=103733777135894690636&rtpof=true&sd=tr ue>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. Two structures have been established for the effective delivery of technical assistance. First, the IDEA Support Network was established to provide consistency and continuity of statewide implementation of professional learning materials. This network consists of AEA administrators responsible for professional learning in each of 9 AEAs and Iowa Department of Education (DE) program consultants. It is facilitated by the State Director of Special Education, an AEA Director of Special Education and a program manager. IDEA Support Network started with the topic of SDI Literacy Implementation and SSIP work but has expanded to address any statewide special education initiative. The IDEA Support Network was a major contributor to the provision of timely and relevant information during the initial stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to continued oversight of the SDI literacy work, the IDEA Support Network is currently focused on professional learning for the roll-out of a new statewide IFSP/IEP data system. The second structure, the SDI Literacy Implementation Network, was established to provide leadership to the state around SDI literacy implementation to ensure consistency and fidelity to the SDI Framework and to the resources, materials, and tools developed by the Design Teams in each of the following instructional focus areas: preschool (PS), K-6 literacy (K-6), and significant disabilities (SD). Responsibilities of the SDI Literacy Implementation Network include: developing communication tools to use with AEA, district, and/or school staff and other stakeholder groups; coordinating revisions and development of professional learning materials; and providing and monitoring implementation guidance (negotiables and non-negotiables) for multiple levels (state, district, building, classroom).

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. SDI Coaches work with teachers to implement SDI professional learning in their classroom(s). Coaching conversations take place a minimum of once per month throughout the learning and implementation. Coaching support is provided for Year 1 coaches using support materials that focus on both generic coaching skills as well as professional learning that is specific to the content area (PS, K-6, SD). Year 2 coaches continue to engage with support materials that enhance their ability to be a coach and to assist with further content-specific professional learning.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Professional learning packages for each content area (PS, K-6, SD) have been finalized. Professional learning leads (PLLs) have been identified and trained in each of the nine area education agencies (AEAs). The PLLs identify districts / teachers to engage in the SDI training, implementation, and coaching. The PLLs deliver this training regionally. Ongoing support for the PLLs occurs monthly through a Community of Practice (CoP) structure facilitated by the state lead in each content area.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. Evaluation of the technical assistance system (e.g., SDI Literacy Implementation Network) occurs through system protocols, procedures, and decision-making guides that are used with fidelity. This technical assistance group oversees implementation across the state and ensures that all packages are implemented as designed and with fidelity. Implementation was monitored through checklists, observations, and participation in all aspects of SDI implementation in each area of focus.

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. Evaluation of coaching practices and implementation occurs through the Coaching Self-Assessment (CSA), which is administered each fall and spring to all SDI instructional practices coaches. Data from the CSA is utilized as part of a continuous improvement process. Based on the data, coaching support needs are identified, resources are provided, and next steps for implementation are determined. The continuous improvement process based on CSA data was replicated each fall and spring.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Evaluation of the delivery of high-quality professional learning occurs partially through the FIT, which is administered each fall and spring to teachers engaged in the SDI professional learning. Data from the FIT is also used as part of a continuous improvement process. Based on the data, areas of need are identified, additional training and/or coaching is provided, and support for implementation is provided to teachers. The continuous improvement process based on FIT data was replicated each fall and spring.

Review of the FIT data (teacher implementation data), student early literacy data and coaching self assessment data supported the decision to move forward with the scale-up of the implementation of SDI across the state through the AEAs. Collected data are reviewed and analyzed at the state, AEA, and local level to identify areas of strength and growth.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Strategy 1. Establish a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI. The SDI Literacy Implementation Network will continue to meet regularly to build consistency across the state related to the implementation and support of SDI literacy. The group will continue to provide and monitor implementation guidance to ensure fidelity of implementation across the state, coordinate revisions and development of professional learning materials, and utilize communication tools to use with stakeholder groups.

Strategy 2. Build capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity. More AEAs will support a network of SDI coaches in partnership with their general education coaching support counterparts. The coaching networks will continue to build knowledge and skills of coaches to support SDI implementation in districts / schools / classrooms.

Strategy 3. Deliver high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. Working in partnership with AEA leadership, additional PLLs will be trained to assist in the delivery of high-quality professional learning to districts as the scale-up of SDI implementation continues.

Continued next steps: a. Continue to support AEAs in implementing the three SSIP strategies of the SSIP Logic Model related to continued implementation and scale-up of SDI Literacy. b. Ensure fidelity of AEA-provided professional development delivery and coaching support to new districts. c. Use of professional learning materials and supports for instructional practices and system coaches across the system.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Implementation of the SDI project has focused on the following practices: (a) establishing a technical assistance system to effectively implement and support personnel preparation and professional development in the area of SDI; (b) building capacity of Iowa's coaching network so that network

participants have the capacity to train, coach, and support delivery of SDI with integrity; and (c) delivering high-quality professional development so that SDI is implemented with fidelity and effectively improves learning for a wide range of learners. As we move forward with the scale-up of SDI professional learning, coaching, and technical assistance to additional districts / schools, the focus continues to be on implementation fidelity. As professional learning occurs across the AEAs, it is expected that the materials will be used as designed with teachers as they are brought into the learning. It is expected that coaching will occur at least monthly. The SDI Literacy Implementation Network monitors the fidelity of implementation to ensure that there is consistency in delivery and coaching across the state. Data from the initial group of schools who engage in SDI professional learning and are supported by regular coaching indicated significant change in teacher practice, which also had a positive impact on student outcomes. We believe our plan for scale-up will have similar results.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Iowa's evidence-based practices are rooted in implementation science and are focused on infrastructure supports. See above description of infrastructure strategies.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SIMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

Implementation of effective specially designed instruction requires educators to accurately diagnose for instructional design, design for instructional delivery, deliver for student engagement, and engage for results. There are many evidence-based practices that align to an individual's need, the key is supporting all educators to make accurate and timely data-based decisions. The infrastructure to support them, however, is not yet strong enough to reach every teacher in every classroom. Iowa's evidence-based practices, therefore, are rooted in implementation science and are focused on infrastructure supports.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Framework Implementation Tool (FIT) data. The FIT is a tool that teachers utilize (fall and spring) to self-assess their implementation of the key SDI Framework components of Diagnose, Design, and Deliver. This data is shared with district leadership teams and coaches to determine relative strengths and areas of growth in the implementation of SDI professional learning. AEAs and statewide teams use the data to determine fidelity of the delivery of the professional learning as well as the supports that teachers need to implement the learning. Coach Self-Assessment (CSA) data. The CSA is a tool that coaches utilize (fall and spring) to self-assess their ability to coach teachers in implementing the key SDI Framework components of Diagnose, Design, and Deliver. These data are shared with stakeholders as part of a continuous improvement process to determine supports that coaches need to enhance their ability to coach teachers in implementing the SDI professional learning. Fidelity checks for each area of focus (PS, K-6, SD). Each content area has implementation checklists, which are used for data collection regarding the level of fidelity of implementing the professional learning. The fidelity checklists for each area of focus assist coaches and teachers in determining how well the evidence practices are being implemented in each classroom.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

NA

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Continue to support AEAs in implementing the three SSIP strategies of the SSIP Logic Model related to continued implementation and scale-up of SDI Literacy. b. Ensure fidelity of AEA-provided professional development delivery and coaching support to new districts. c. Use of professional learning materials and supports for instructional practices and system coaches across the system.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

The state used a number of strategies for stakeholder input to the SSIP, in addition to the stakeholder input the state used to develop the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR). Overall input to the APR included review of historical data, baselines, and previous targets, including the SiMr. Informational materials were created for each indicator containing the measurement and calculation, data source, state context related to the indicator data, historical data performance against targets, and options for future targets. Stakeholder groups included the Area Education Agencies (AEA) special education directors, Iowa Department of Education (Department) special education staff and Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). SEAP is the ultimate mechanism for stakeholder recommendations on targets in the SPP, including revisions. SEAP meets seven times a year and has organized those meetings so that discussion regarding indicators occurs throughout the year. IDE staff with responsibility for specific indicators work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement and refine improvement activities. Depending on the indicator, these groups meet monthly or quarterly. Input and feedback from the stakeholders implementing improvement activities is shared by the State to SEAP for final consideration. Members of SEAP representation includes: parents, individuals with disabilities, general and special education teachers, local administrators and building leaders, AEA consultants and administrators, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation counselors and administrators, State juvenile and adult corrections state agency, institutes of Higher Education and other state and community organizations. Activities for target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APRs included reviewing historical data, discussing the context of relevant special education topics in the state related to the indicators, and reviewing and voting on sets of potential targets for all years of the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR based on the aforementioned activities. These stakeholder groups were also engaged in conversations about improvement strategies that the State could employ in order to reach the ambitious targets set. The Department sent invitations to all parent advocacy organizations including Autism Speaks, Arc, and Disability Rights Iowa. In addition, Iowa's Parent Training and Information Center (ASK Resource) extended invitations out through their network. The SSIP work to improve the effectiveness of specially designed instruction in early literacy has a number of feedback loops built into the work itself. First, those involved in local districts have opportunities throughout the year to provide feedback on relevancy and quality of training. This information is shared both with the SDI Literacy Network and an internal IDE SDI Literacy Team. Any data suggesting a significant need for change in strategies is reviewed by the IDEA Support Team and ultimately the AEA Directors of Special Education and SEAP. Additionally, during this reporting period two webinars were held specific to the topic of effective specially designed instruction.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Membership on development groups and task teams; feedback loops; evaluation surveys; focus groups.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

For multiple years stakeholders have expressed concern over the State's original SiMR (Increase the percentage of learners with disabilities who are proficient readers by the end of third grade). Concerns expressed primarily focused on the measure's inability to represent an individual's growth in reading that improved their reading ability, but was not large enough to affect the proficiency scales on an assessment.

The State sought input from a variety of literacy assessment and evaluation stakeholders on possible changes to the SiMR that would be more sensitive than the previous measure of proficiency. After reviewing historical student data, several possible measures were presented to the State. These measures were then shared with the stakeholder groups described above and a new SiMR was selected.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

None

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

NA

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

NA

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

Per OSEP request, a link to the current Theory of Action has been added.

## **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

#### **Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

##### **Name:**

Barbara Guy

##### **Title:**

State Director of Special Education

##### **Email:**

barbara.guy@iowa.gov

##### **Phone:**

5156894073

##### **Submitted on:**

04/28/22 7:47:47 PM

## ED Attachments



IA-B-Dispute-Resol  
ution-2020-21.pdf



IA-2022DataRubricP  
artB.xlsx



ia-resultsmatrix-202  
2b.pdf