

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 53.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 52.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of $\geq 75\%$.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 17.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 19.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of $\leq 25\%$.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88.4% for reading and 96.6% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87.4% for reading and 93.9% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of $\geq 93\%$ for reading. The State met its FFY 2007 target of $\geq 93\%$ for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.1% for reading and 97.4% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 96.0% for reading and for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of $\geq 95\%$ for reading and for math.</p> <p>The State did not submit Table 6.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 39.88% for reading and 48.55% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 33.6% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 42.5% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of $\geq 34\%$.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are .59%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of .30%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 1.00%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to describe, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State explained that due to personnel shifts, it did not conduct a thorough analysis or make any findings based on the FFY 2005 data. However, the State stated that it considered the FFY 2005 data when findings were made on May 16, 2008 for FFY 2006 and when determinations were made in October 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table also required the State to demonstrate correction of noncompliance in those LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with regard to the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State reported in the FFY 2007 APR that there was one LEA with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 and 2006 data. The State reported that the LEA, upon receiving notification on April 14, 2008, developed and implemented an action plan addressing the noncompliance, including, but not</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) (based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 data) was corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that the LEAs with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 (identified in FFY 2007). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
	limited to, the review of policies, practices, and procedures to ensure compliance.	to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).															
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.															
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 948 1467 1321"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>62.29</td> <td>62.81</td> <td>≥ 60.38</td> <td>0.52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>13.35</td> <td>13.06</td> <td>≤ 15.29</td> <td>0.29%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	62.29	62.81	≥ 60.38	0.52%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.35	13.06	≤ 15.29	0.29%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress													
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	62.29	62.81	≥ 60.38	0.52%													
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.35	13.06	≤ 15.29	0.29%													

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
	<p>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	2.09	2.50	≤ 1.21	-0.41%									
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>					<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1084 1455 1360"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="550 1084 1060 1258">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 1084 1192 1258">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1192 1084 1325 1258">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1325 1084 1455 1258">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1258 1060 1360">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1258 1192 1360">10</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1258 1325 1360">8.5</td> <td data-bbox="1325 1258 1455 1360">13.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	10	8.5	13.5	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	10	8.5	13.5											

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	44.1	64.2	55.7	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	10.4	19.4	.4	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	3.9	1.7	2.1	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.6	6.2	28.3	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 93.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 88.4%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to indicate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> <p>The State reported that the FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) parent survey response data by age category were representative of the State's population. However, the FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) parent survey response data by racial/ethnic category were not representative of the State's population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>				<p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that was representative of the State's population by age category, however, the data were not representative of the State's population by racial/ethnic category. The State indicated that in order to obtain more representative results in the future, it would work to increase the response rate in coming years. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are .30%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to clarify in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, and in its SPP, that the recalculated data for FFY 2006 are the revised baseline data. The State provided the required clarification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must report in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-20, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.15%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to submit revised baseline data for FFY 2006 based on a complete analysis of the data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided the requested baseline data.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of the 14 LEAs identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data were sent written notification of the findings on May 16, 2008 and the remaining seven LEAs were sent written notification of noncompliance on July 1, 2008. Although the one-year timeline for correction of these findings has not yet expired, the State reported that the 14 LEAs identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data established CAPs to ensure compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301-300.311. The State also reported that four of the seven LEAs identified with noncompliance on July 1, 2008 based on FFY 2006 data have corrected the noncompliance. Although these data are outside the reporting period for the FFY 2007 APR, the State’s FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award included Special Conditions, that required the State to report in the FFY 2007 APR on any findings made after May 2008 and correction of those findings.</p>	<p>CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance within the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must report in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; 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.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State provided information on correction of noncompliance of findings made in or after May 2008, pursuant to the Special Conditions on its FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that noncompliance</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 regarding the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>As the State reported in the FFY 2007 APR and had informed OSEP during the October 2008 verification visit, the State did not make findings of noncompliance related to this indicator based on LEAs' data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 until May 16, 2008. Because those findings were made during FFY 2007, the State will be required to report on the timely correction of the findings in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. The State reported that, as of December 12, 2008, 40 of the 305 findings the State made on May 16, 2008 and July 1, 2008 had been corrected.</p>	<p>FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State provided information on correction of noncompliance of findings made in or after May 2008, pursuant to the Special Conditions on its FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award.</p>
<p>12. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 91.7%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data reported for FFY 2007 do not include the date on which services began for children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. The State indicated that, although revisions were made to its data system to collect all of the required data, the change was not reflected in the data reported for FFY 2007 (but will be in the data collected for FFY 2008). Therefore, OSEP cannot determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that noncompliance regarding the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when</p>	<p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data beginning with the FFY 2008 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b),</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>the noncompliance was corrected. As the State reported in the FFY 2007 APR, and had informed OSEP during the October 2008 verification visit, the State did not make findings of noncompliance related to this indicator based on LEAs' data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 until May 16, 2008. Because those findings were made during FFY 2007, the State will be required to report on the timely correction of the findings in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that, based on FFY 2006 data, it made 70 findings of noncompliance in May 2008 (FFY 2007), and that 39 of those findings had been corrected by the time the State submitted its FFY 2007 APR.</p>	<p>including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State provided information on correction of noncompliance of findings made in or after May 2008, pursuant to the Special Conditions on its FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award.</p>
<p>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 postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 45.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 17.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that noncompliance regarding the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected. As the State reported in the FFY 2007 APR and had informed OSEP during the October 2008 verification visit, the State did not make findings of noncompliance related to this indicator based on LEAs' data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 until May 16, 2008. Because those findings were made during FFY 2007, the State will be required to report on</p>	<p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	the timely correction of the findings in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.	that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 62.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 70.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 70.6%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 100%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State acknowledged that these data were based only on findings of noncompliance from complaint investigations and due process hearings. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award included Special Conditions, which required the State, with the FFY 2007 APR, to report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The specific number of findings of noncompliance that the State made in May 2008; b. The number and percent of those findings that had already been corrected by February 1, 2009; c. When CAPs for the May 2008 letters of findings, and any subsequent letters of findings, were issued and the status of the CAPs, including any other actions the State has undertaken to ensure that the CAPs are being implemented and that the noncompliance identified in the May 16, 2008 letters of findings and any subsequent letters of findings will be corrected within one year of identification; and d. That the State has issued determinations to LEAs for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. 	<p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2007 in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data beginning with the FFY 2008 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State provided information on correction of noncompliance of findings made in or after May 2008, pursuant to the Special Conditions on its FFY 2008 Part B Grant Award.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 (identified in FFY 2007), the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported in the FFY 2007 APR that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 655 findings of noncompliance were made on May 16, 2008 and 30 findings of noncompliance were made on July 1, 2008, based on FFY 2006 data; 69 findings of noncompliance were made on December 12, 2008 based on FFY 2007 data. The above listed findings were made only with regard to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13; b. 77 (12%) of 655 findings of noncompliance made on May 16, 2008; six (20%) of 30 findings made on July 1, 2008; and 2 of the 69 findings made on December 12, 2008 were corrected; c. On July 23, 2008, the State issued letters to LEAs requesting CAPs for the May 16, 2008 and July 1, 2008 findings of noncompliance; the CAPs were due to the State on September 5, 2008. On December 12, 2008 the State issued letters to LEAs requesting CAPs for the December 12, 2008 findings of noncompliance; and the CAPs were due to the State on January 16, 2009. Each LEA continues to implement its CAP. State staff contact each LEA monthly to provide technical assistance, collect data, and monitor LEA progress. Further, the State is working to ensure correction of noncompliance through data collection, analysis, and reporting for Indicators 10, 11 and 12. The State also reported that it conducted a transition checklist analysis and verification for Indicator 13 to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year. Finally, the State will be piloting an on-site verification with 10 LEAs during the Spring of 2009. The final on-site monitoring process will be completed by FFY 2009; and d. The State issued local determinations on October 20, 2008 using data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. <p>OSEP will respond to the State's second progress report in a separate document.</p>	<p>State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 10, 11, 12 and 13, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the written complaint timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83%. These data are based on six due process hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 30.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 55%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 82%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 52.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>