

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 58.95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 55.71%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 56.71%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation 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).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 26.99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 CODA data of 30.01%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of <math>\leq 24\%</math>.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 81%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 94%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96% for reading and 96% for</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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 IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>math. The FFY 2008 data for reading were 96.8%. The FFY 2009 data for math represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 97.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this response table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with</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 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 43% for reading and 51% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 48.1% for reading and 56.9% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 36% for reading and 42% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <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 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 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.16%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 1.16%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of <math>\leq 0.50\%</math>.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 239 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten or more students with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than ten days in a school year and were excluded from the calculation.</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 revised (or 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 that noncompliance, identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected.</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>The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and 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</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>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>The State reported that noncompliance identified based on FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified based on FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). 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>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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2007 and 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 1.45%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>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 273 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten or more students with disabilities within any racial/ethnic group suspended or expelled for more than ten days in a school year and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that five 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 five 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 revised (or 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>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, 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 them, if necessary to ensure</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 743 1583 1222"> <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">63.77</td> <td align="center">64.89</td> <td align="center">60.40</td> <td align="center">1.12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.94</td> <td align="center">12.51</td> <td align="center">15.27</td> <td align="center">0.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.42</td> <td align="center">2.46</td> <td align="center">1.19</td> <td align="center">-0.04%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2009 target for 5C.</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	63.77	64.89	60.40	1.12%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.94	12.51	15.27	0.43%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.42	2.46	1.19	-0.04%	<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	63.77	64.89	60.40	1.12%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.94	12.51	15.27	0.43%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.42	2.46	1.19	-0.04%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the</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 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>																												
regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]																														
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]	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 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 711 1583 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 711 957 813"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 711 1163 813"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 711 1373 813"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 711 1583 813"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 813 957 951"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 813 1163 951">52.0</td> <td data-bbox="1163 813 1373 951">66.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 813 1583 951">52.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 951 957 1118"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 951 1163 1118">65.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 951 1373 1118">65.0</td> <td data-bbox="1373 951 1583 1118">65.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1118 957 1224"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1118 1163 1224">76.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1118 1373 1224">63.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1118 1583 1224">77.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1224 957 1320"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1224 1163 1320"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1224 1373 1320"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1224 1583 1320"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1320 957 1458"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1320 1163 1458">40.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1320 1373 1458">36.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1320 1583 1458">41.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1458 957 1487"><b>Outcome B:</b></td> <td data-bbox="957 1458 1163 1487">47.8</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1458 1373 1487">32.4</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1458 1583 1487">48.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	52.0	66.1	52.5	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.1	65.0	65.5	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	76.7	63.1	77.0	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	40.7	36.1	41.0	<b>Outcome B:</b>	47.8	32.4	48.0	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. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	52.0	66.1	52.5																											
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	65.1	65.0	65.5																											
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	76.7	63.1	77.0																											
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	40.7	36.1	41.0																											
<b>Outcome B:</b>	47.8	32.4	48.0																											

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>
	Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	65.4	31.5	64.5	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of 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 revised baseline data for FFY 2009, targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, 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 2011 and 2012, and the revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010. The revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 are less rigorous than the previously-established targets; the State explained that it had revised the methodology for this indicator to a census collection, which resulted in the State receiving much more complete data.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 revised baseline data for this indicator are 42.2%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were collected. The State met its revised FFY 2009 target of 42.2%.</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 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 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of .29%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were 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>The State reported that two of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten students in a given population in special education and</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>related services for overrepresentation and underrepresentation and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</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 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 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 4.05%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 28 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no 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.”</p> <p>The State reported that three of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students in a given population in a specific disability category for overrepresentation and underrepresentation and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by January 20, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected. The State reported that, since it did not identify student-specific cases of noncompliance in FFY 2007, there were no student-specific cases to correct; however, the State reported that in order to determine the compliance status of the two remaining districts with outstanding FFY 2007 findings of noncompliance, it conducted a random individual file review and determined that the two districts were in compliance and correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. The State reported that effective with the FFY 2009 APR, it has modified its Indicator 10 monitoring procedures to include individual student file reviews in LEAs who meet the State’s criteria for disproportionality, if the State’s review of the LEA’s data, self assessment, policies, procedures and practices does not substantiate that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. It is unclear whether the State’s monitoring procedures for verifying correction of noncompliance for this</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>Within 90 days of receipt of this response table, the State must provide a copy of its monitoring procedures demonstrating that the State verifies correction of noncompliance under this indicator consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, i.e., that the State verifies that each LEA identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301-300.311 is: (1) 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.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>indicator are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State reported that nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</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%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 87 of 90 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>The State reported that 294 of 295 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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>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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</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</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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 97.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.74%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 94 of 95 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>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</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>State reported for this indicator.</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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 was corrected.</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 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) 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; 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</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>
		verify the correction.
<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 with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 80.2%.</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 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</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>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>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 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. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's reported FFY2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 34.3% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 49.1% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 86.1% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 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 97.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 327 of 334 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>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.</p> <p>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 addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>
		must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
<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 remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. 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 are 80%.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 71%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 31%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Indiana Part B FFY 2009 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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 53%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 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%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.62%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</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 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</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>