

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's revised FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 55.7%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of <math>\geq 75\%</math>.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 17.1%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of <math>\leq 25\%</math>.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 81%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, because the FFY 2008 data are not comparable to the FFY 2007 data. For FFY 2008, the State reported the percentage of districts that met the State’s AYP targets for both reading and math, while for FFY 2007, the State reported separate percentages for districts meeting the targets for reading and the targets for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 93.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96.8% for reading and 97.3% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: <a href="http://www.doe.in.gov/exceptional/speced/monitoring.html">http://www.doe.in.gov/exceptional/speced/monitoring.html</a>.</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>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 54.0% for reading and 64.1% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of <math>\geq 35\%</math> for Reading and <math>\geq 41\%</math> for Mathematics.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: <a href="http://www.doe.in.gov/exceptional/speced/monitoring.html">http://www.doe.in.gov/exceptional/speced/monitoring.html</a>.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 data are 1.16%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of .59%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of .75%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State also reported that the one LEA identified in FFY 2006 with a significant discrepancy has failed to correct the noncompliance. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not corrected. The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs 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; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 581 1467 1089"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>62.81</td> <td>63.77</td> <td>60.39</td> <td>0.96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>13.06</td> <td>12.94</td> <td>15.28</td> <td>0.12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>2.50</td> <td>2.42</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>0.08%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.81	63.77	60.39	0.96%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.06	12.94	15.28	0.12%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.50	2.42	1.2	0.08%	<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 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	62.81	63.77	60.39	0.96%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.06	12.94	15.28	0.12%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.50	2.42	1.2	0.08%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>																				

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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 measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 696 1444 1310"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 696 921 813">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="921 696 1194 813"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1194 696 1444 813"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 921 997"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="921 813 1194 997">52.0</td> <td data-bbox="1194 813 1444 997">40.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 997 921 1214"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="921 997 1194 1214">65.1</td> <td data-bbox="1194 997 1444 1214">47.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1214 921 1310"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors</td> <td data-bbox="921 1214 1194 1310">76.7</td> <td data-bbox="1194 1214 1444 1310">65.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	52.0	40.7	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.1	47.8	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors	76.7	65.4	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>												
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	52.0	40.7												
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.1	47.8												
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors	76.7	65.4												

<sup>1</sup> 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 six years of age or exited the program.

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to meet their needs (%)			
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 90.11%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 80.4%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 88.6%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<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 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0.29%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 0.30%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. However, because the State did not make any student-specific findings of noncompliance for this indicator, the State could not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State noted in its revised FFY 2008 APR that it will work in cooperation with OSEP to clarify its procedures to "prevent and address</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's data demonstrating compliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report in the FFY 2009 APR on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. Further, although the State reported that it timely corrected the one FFY 2007 finding of noncompliance, the State has not, as explained in the previous column, demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and 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,</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	systemic as well as student-specific noncompliance.”	<p>300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 4.05%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 3.85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 29 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 14 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to reviewing the State’s data demonstrating compliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. Further,</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State reported that two of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>However, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in 2007 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. The State reported in its revised FFY 2008 APR that it did not make any student-specific findings of noncompliance for this indicator. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State noted in its revised FFY 2008 APR that it will work in cooperation with OSEP to clarify its procedures to “prevent and address systemic as well as student-specific noncompliance.”</p> <p>The State also reported that none of the nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the noncompliance.</p>	<p>although the State reported that it timely corrected two of the FFY 2007 finding of noncompliance, the State has not, as explained in the previous column, demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and the two districts with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the nine districts with uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 have corrected the noncompliance. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 87.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 260 of 295 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that 11 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 24 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and each of the 24 LEAs with</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>uncorrected FFY 2007 noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92.74%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report valid and reliable data for this indicator for FFY 2007. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 66 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of intervention for three consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005, 2006 and 2007 APRs, and was required to submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by July 31, 2009. The State submitted the required CAP on July 6, 2009, with revisions on August 3, 2009.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100%</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. 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 was invited to the IEP Team meeting</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 295 of 298 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, and that all three remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.7%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report valid and reliable data for FFY 2007. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 882 of 922 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not provide information on the correction of the remaining noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP's 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 40 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>In reporting, in the FFY 2009 APR, on correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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 respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on nine due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 71%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 66%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 30.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 55%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 52.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97.7%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		20 Data Rubric.