

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 79.55%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 reported data of 84.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 91.30%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																					
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 20.45%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 reported data of 15.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 14.08%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																					
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 22.73%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 42.31%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 63%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																					
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="558 1344 1562 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.30%</td> <td>98.92%</td> <td>95.00%</td> <td>99.00%</td> <td>99.30%</td> <td>95.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	99.30%	98.92%	95.00%	99.00%	99.30%	95.00%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																			
3	99.30%	98.92%	95.00%	99.00%	99.30%	95.00%																	

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
	<table border="1"> <tr><td>4</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.39%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.28%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.40%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.10%</td><td>99.26%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.66%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.62%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>99.10%</td><td>99.47%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>99.10%</td><td>99.37%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>99.40%</td><td>99.36%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>96.80%</td><td>99.26%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>98.10%</td><td>98.19%</td><td>95.00%</td><td>98.30%</td><td>98.75%</td><td>95.00%</td></tr> </table>	4	99.40%	99.39%	95.00%	99.40%	99.28%	95.00%	5	99.40%	99.40%	95.00%	99.10%	99.26%	95.00%	6	99.40%	99.66%	95.00%	99.40%	99.62%	95.00%	7	99.10%	99.47%	95.00%	99.10%	99.37%	95.00%	8	99.40%	99.36%	95.00%	96.80%	99.26%	95.00%	HS	98.10%	98.19%	95.00%	98.30%	98.75%	95.00%							<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>																					
4	99.40%	99.39%	95.00%	99.40%	99.28%	95.00%																																																																	
5	99.40%	99.40%	95.00%	99.10%	99.26%	95.00%																																																																	
6	99.40%	99.66%	95.00%	99.40%	99.62%	95.00%																																																																	
7	99.10%	99.47%	95.00%	99.10%	99.37%	95.00%																																																																	
8	99.40%	99.36%	95.00%	96.80%	99.26%	95.00%																																																																	
HS	98.10%	98.19%	95.00%	98.30%	98.75%	95.00%																																																																	
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>38.47%</td><td>35.23%</td><td>74.10%</td><td>47.50%</td><td>45.09%</td><td>73.90%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>45.01%</td><td>37.01%</td><td>76.00%</td><td>50.05%</td><td>44.88%</td><td>74.70%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>43.18%</td><td>37.37%</td><td>76.40%</td><td>46.31%</td><td>44.20%</td><td>76.60%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>28.08%</td><td>24.07%</td><td>69.70%</td><td>35.51%</td><td>33.20%</td><td>72.80%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>28.16%</td><td>24.09%</td><td>71.50%</td><td>37.04%</td><td>30.94%</td><td>72.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>27.71%</td><td>25.89%</td><td>73.30%</td><td>32.48%</td><td>28.21%</td><td>72.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>28.63%</td><td>30.97%</td><td>79.30%</td><td>35.20%</td><td>28.75%</td><td>79.30%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>							<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	38.47%	35.23%	74.10%	47.50%	45.09%	73.90%	4	45.01%	37.01%	76.00%	50.05%	44.88%	74.70%	5	43.18%	37.37%	76.40%	46.31%	44.20%	76.60%	6	28.08%	24.07%	69.70%	35.51%	33.20%	72.80%	7	28.16%	24.09%	71.50%	37.04%	30.94%	72.00%	8	27.71%	25.89%	73.30%	32.48%	28.21%	72.00%	HS	28.63%	30.97%	79.30%	35.20%	28.75%	79.30%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																																																																	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																																			
3	38.47%	35.23%	74.10%	47.50%	45.09%	73.90%																																																																	
4	45.01%	37.01%	76.00%	50.05%	44.88%	74.70%																																																																	
5	43.18%	37.37%	76.40%	46.31%	44.20%	76.60%																																																																	
6	28.08%	24.07%	69.70%	35.51%	33.20%	72.80%																																																																	
7	28.16%	24.09%	71.50%	37.04%	30.94%	72.00%																																																																	
8	27.71%	25.89%	73.30%	32.48%	28.21%	72.00%																																																																	
HS	28.63%	30.97%	79.30%	35.20%	28.75%	79.30%																																																																	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p>																																																															

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>expulsion: 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 [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.11%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 2.75%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.20%.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected LEAs to revise the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that three of 361 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of a minimum of ten students with disabilities enrolled and three students with disabilities suspended or expelled, and were excluded from the calculation. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0.55%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2010 APR demonstrating compliance. Because the State</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that eight districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that two districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected LEAs to revise the LEAs’ 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 361 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of a minimum of ten students with disabilities enrolled and three students with disabilities suspended or expelled in the race/ethnicity category, and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's methodology for identifying "significant discrepancy" and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 781 1583 1255"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">61.81</td> <td align="center">61.72</td> <td align="center">65.00</td> <td align="center">-0.09%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">7.72</td> <td align="center">8.36</td> <td align="center">12.50</td> <td align="center">-0.64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">3.52</td> <td align="center">2.33</td> <td align="center">3.60</td> <td align="center">1.19%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5B and 5C but did not meet its FFY 2009 target for 5A.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.81	61.72	65.00	-0.09%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7.72	8.36	12.50	-0.64%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.52	2.33	3.60	1.19%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61.81	61.72	65.00	-0.09%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7.72	8.36	12.50	-0.64%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	3.52	2.33	3.60	1.19%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010</p>																				

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 813 1583 1489"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td>66.25%</td> <td>69.29%</td> <td>69.75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td>73.97%</td> <td>73.14%</td> <td>77.47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td>56.67%</td> <td>59.21%</td> <td>60.17%</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td>53.54%</td> <td>50.54%</td> <td>57.04%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B:</td> <td>34.92%</td> <td>29.65%</td> <td>38.42%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	66.25%	69.29%	69.75%	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	73.97%	73.14%	77.47%	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	56.67%	59.21%	60.17%	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	53.54%	50.54%	57.04%	Outcome B:	34.92%	29.65%	38.42%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	66.25%	69.29%	69.75%																											
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	73.97%	73.14%	77.47%																											
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	56.67%	59.21%	60.17%																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	53.54%	50.54%	57.04%																											
Outcome B:	34.92%	29.65%	38.42%																											

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.98%	57.14%	58.48%	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 78.27% for ages 3-5. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 77.70%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80.00% for ages 3-5.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 65.79% for ages 6-21. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 71.37%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 69.00% for ages 6-21.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 10%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that two AEAs were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one AEA 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.”</p>				<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the AEA identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that no AEAs were excluded from the calculation because every AEA had a racial or ethnic group that met the minimum “n” size of ten students.</p>	<p>racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the AEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the AEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 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</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.04%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.74%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 195 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 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. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (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</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.57%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.39%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 49 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 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% compliance) based on a review of</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2010 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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 66.48%.</p>	<p>Although OSEP did not consider data for Indicator 13 in its determinations for FFY 2009, OSEP is concerned about the State's very low FFY 2009 data (below 75%) for this indicator. In 2012, OSEP will consider the State's FFY 2010 data for Indicator 13 in determinations.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
14. Percent of youth who are no	The State provided targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement	OSEP appreciates the State's

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>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>activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 34.09% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 53.03% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 83.99% 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> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 651 1583 1224"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Baseline Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (%)</td> <td align="center">25.70%</td> <td align="center">34.09%</td> <td align="center">28.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (%)</td> <td align="center">48.65%</td> <td align="center">53.03%</td> <td align="center">49.65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome 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 (%)</td> <td align="center">84.14%</td> <td align="center">83.99%</td> <td align="center">85.14%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 14A and 14B from the FFY 2008 baseline data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Baseline Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (%)	25.70%	34.09%	28.20%	Outcome B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (%)	48.65%	53.03%	49.65%	Outcome 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 (%)	84.14%	83.99%	85.14%	<p>efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Baseline Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>															
Outcome A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (%)	25.70%	34.09%	28.20%															
Outcome B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (%)	48.65%	53.03%	49.65%															
Outcome 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 (%)	84.14%	83.99%	85.14%															
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.37%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining 47 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were</p>																

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>of 100%. The State reported that 7,440 of 7,487 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 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 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on seven complaints. The State met its FFY 2009 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>
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2009 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>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010</p>

Iowa Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.	APR, due February 1, 2012.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 76.19%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 75%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 75%.</p>	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.