Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR)

Part B Indicator Measurement Table[1]

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	**Data Source:** State data source and measurement. **Measurement:** Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.	*If State uses 618 data sampling is not allowed.* States must use State-level graduation data. A State must provide the following: • A narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain why. • The calculation used to determine graduation rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. Measurement for youth with disabilities should be the same measurement as for all youth. If not, indicate the difference and explain why there is a difference.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	**Data Source:** State data source and measurement. **Measurement:** Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.	*If State uses 618 data sampling is not allowed.* States must use State-level dropout data. A State must provide the following: • A narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain why. • The calculation used to determine dropout rate for youth with IEPs and all youth. Measurement for youth with disabilities should be the same measurement as for all youth. If not, indicate

[1] Monitoring Priorities, indicators, and measurements included on the *Part B Indicator Measurement Table* are to be used to populate designated sections of the SPP and APR Templates. Populated templates can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/index.html

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		the difference and explain why there is a difference.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))	**Data Source:** Data source is assessment data collected for purposes of determining AYP. Participation and performance data to be taken from data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** A. Percent = # of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the State times 100. B. Participation rate = a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed; b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100); c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100); d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100). Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a. C. Proficiency rate = a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* States should use the same assessments used for reporting under NCLB. States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. In A include only districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100); c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100); d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100). Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.	
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)22))	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing rates for children with disabilities to rates for nondisabled within a district or by comparing among LEAs for children with disabilities in the State. **Measurement:** A. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the State times 100. B. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* States must use the data that were reported for Table 5, Section A, Columns 3A, 3B, and 3C, *Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More then 10 Days* of the Annual Report of Children Served. Table 5 can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/index.html Describe the results of the State's examination of data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The States examination must include one of the following comparisons:

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the State times 100. Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."	• Among local educational agencies within the State, or • To the rates for nondisabled children within the agencies. In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies. If discrepancies occurred, describe how the State education 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 this requirement. Section B of this Indicator is new and baseline and targets are to be provided in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP, describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY APR due 02/01/07.
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;[2] B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** A. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100. B. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

[2] At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100. C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.	
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))	**Data Source:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.
7. Percent of preschool children 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:** A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.	*Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. First year (2/1/07) will be status upon entry. Following years (starting with 2/1/08) will be progress from entry to exit or other naturally occurring point near exit (such as IEP review) for children who have received preschool services for 6 months or more. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	c. 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. If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference. B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. c. 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. If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference. C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs: a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. c. 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. If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.	
8. 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.	*Sampling **of parents to receive the survey** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP.* States may wish to utilize information/surveys developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) or the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO). States must submit a copy of any survey used for this indicator. States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
9. 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:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100. Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data for all children with disabilities. The data analyzed must be the same data reported to OSEP on the *Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count).* Tables for the child count (Table 1) of the Annual Report of Children Served can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/index.html. States should consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionality to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to IDEAdata@westat.com or phoning 1-888-819-7024. Describe the method(s) used to determine disproportionality in the cell labeled *Baseline/Trend Data.* If the State has previously identified significant disproportionality, describe how the State addressed the disproportionality, including review of policies, procedures and practices and revisions, as appropriate. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
10. 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:** Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served). **Measurement:** Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100. Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.	*Sampling from State's 618 data is not allowed.* Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has previously identified a problem, or if a State has reason to believe that there are issues with other disability categories (i.e., through written complaints, due process filings, etc.), then the State should explore the remaining disability categories as necessary. The data analyzed must be the same data reported to OSEP on the *Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count).* Tables for the child count (Table 1) of the Annual Report of Children Served can be found at http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/index.html. States should consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionality to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. If a State chooses to use risk ratios, Westat has developed an electronic spreadsheet that calculates both weighted and unweighted risk ratios for State and district-level data. States can request a copy of this file by sending a message to IDEAdata@westat.com or phoning 1-888-819-7024. Describe the method(s) used to determine disproportionality in the cell labeled *Baseline/Trend Data.* If the State has previously identified significant disproportionality, describe how the State addressed the disproportionality, including review of policies, procedures and practices and revisions, as

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
		appropriate. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find		
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline). (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. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline). c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline). Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays. Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.* This indicator is referring to "initial" eligibility determination. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.
Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition		
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for	**Data Source:**	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must*

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	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 eligibility determination. b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays. Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.	*describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. (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 disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.	*When data is taken from State monitoring, States must describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring.* **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	**Data Source:** State selected data source. **Measurement:** Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary	*Sampling **of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school** is allowed. When sampling is used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.	Address all youth who left school including those who graduated, dropped out, aged out, etc. Describe how the above exiters are included in the sample. Data must be collected annually between April and June, inclusive. States must include students who completed school during the prior school year, who dropped out during the prior school year or did not return for the current school year. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.
Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision		
15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))	**Data Source:** Data to be taken from State monitoring, complaints, hearings and other general supervision systems. Indicate the number of agencies monitored related to the monitoring priority areas and indicators and the number of agencies monitored related to areas not included in monitoring priority areas and indicators. **Measurement:** A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification: a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = b divided by a times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year	*States must describe the process for selecting LEAs for monitoring.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. In Measurements A and B, States should reflect monitoring data collected through on-site visits, self-assessments, local performance plans and annual performance reports, desk audits and/or data reviews. In Measurements B and C, areas of noncompliance not related to monitoring priority areas and indicators may be grouped by topical areas. The State should describe the topical areas.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
	of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken. B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification: a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = b divided by a times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken. C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification: a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms. b. # of findings of noncompliance made. c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = c divided by b times 100. For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.	
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within	**Data Source:**	*Sampling is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	Data collected on Attachment 1 **Measurement:** Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.	and compare the results to their target. States are not required to report data at the LEA level.
17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	**Data Source:** Data collected on Attachment 1. **Measurement:** Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. States are not required to report data at the LEA level.
18. 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 on Attachment 1. **Measurement:** Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. States are not required to report data at the LEA level. **New indicator.** Baseline and targets to be provided in FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. In the SPP describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 02/01/07.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	**Data Source:** Data collected on Attachment 1. **Measurement:** Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.	*Sampling is not allowed.* States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. States are not required to report data at the LEA level.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	**Data Source:** State selected data sources, including data from State data system, assessment system, as well as technical assistance and monitoring systems.	States should describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to their target. States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Data Source and Measurement	Instructions for Indicators/Measurement
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	**Measurement:** State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are: a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).	