

Minnesota 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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 85.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 84.9%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 4.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 4.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 66.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 63.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 72.5%.</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.</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 97.7%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with 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 a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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="552 532 1583 938"> <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 align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>64.6%</td> <td>61.2%</td> <td>84.1%</td> <td>81.7%</td> <td>80.7%</td> <td>88%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>64.9%</td> <td>65.9%</td> <td>82.6%</td> <td>71.4%</td> <td>71.8%</td> <td>82.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>65.2%</td> <td>68.9%</td> <td>84.0%</td> <td>59.1%</td> <td>61.6%</td> <td>77.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>59.2%</td> <td>63.6%</td> <td>83.0%</td> <td>52.7%</td> <td>59.1%</td> <td>77.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>51.6%</td> <td>55.5%</td> <td>80.4%</td> <td>48.5%</td> <td>52.4%</td> <td>76.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>53.0%</td> <td>55.6%</td> <td>79.5%</td> <td>44.1%</td> <td>41.9%</td> <td>76.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>63.0%</td> <td>64.9%</td> <td>79.9%</td> <td>25.1%</td> <td>25.7%</td> <td>58.9%</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	64.6%	61.2%	84.1%	81.7%	80.7%	88%	4	64.9%	65.9%	82.6%	71.4%	71.8%	82.7%	5	65.2%	68.9%	84.0%	59.1%	61.6%	77.0%	6	59.2%	63.6%	83.0%	52.7%	59.1%	77.1%	7	51.6%	55.5%	80.4%	48.5%	52.4%	76.5%	8	53.0%	55.6%	79.5%	44.1%	41.9%	76.2%	HS	63.0%	64.9%	79.9%	25.1%	25.7%	58.9%	<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	64.6%	61.2%	84.1%	81.7%	80.7%	88%																																																											
4	64.9%	65.9%	82.6%	71.4%	71.8%	82.7%																																																											
5	65.2%	68.9%	84.0%	59.1%	61.6%	77.0%																																																											
6	59.2%	63.6%	83.0%	52.7%	59.1%	77.1%																																																											
7	51.6%	55.5%	80.4%	48.5%	52.4%	76.5%																																																											
8	53.0%	55.6%	79.5%	44.1%	41.9%	76.2%																																																											
HS	63.0%	64.9%	79.9%	25.1%	25.7%	58.9%																																																											
<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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.4%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 454 of 491 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least ten children with IEPs and at least five children with IEPs suspended and expelled for more than ten days during the school year and were</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected district to revise, policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and</p>																																																															

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>Although the State reported that it identified noncompliance as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State did not report whether it revised (or required the affected LEA to revise), the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEA identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. Rather, the State reported that it required the LEA with noncompliance to review its policies, procedures, and practices and to then report the results of that review to the State and the State will review that report.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data was corrected.</p>	<p>supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the district identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data.</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).</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that the 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>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 .6%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 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 three 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 its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 464 of 491 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least ten children with IEPs and at least five children with IEPs suspended and expelled in a specific racial or ethnic category for more than ten days during the school year and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>Although the State reported that it identified noncompliance as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State did not report whether 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 for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data.</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>In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise, policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with noncompliance based on FFY 2008 data.</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 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</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps					
		<p>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 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</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="548 1453 1583 1516"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1453 980 1516"></td> <td data-bbox="980 1453 1157 1516"><u>FFY 2008</u></td> <td data-bbox="1157 1453 1333 1516"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> <td data-bbox="1333 1453 1470 1516"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> <td data-bbox="1470 1453 1583 1516"><u>Progress</u></td> </tr> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>Progress</u>	<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</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>Progress</u>			

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th align="center"><u>Data</u></th> <th align="center"><u>Data</u></th> <th align="center"><u>Target</u></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">60.7</td> <td align="center">61.4</td> <td align="center">62.5</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">10.3</td> <td align="center">10.3</td> <td align="center">8.8</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">4.3</td> <td align="center">4.3</td> <td align="center">4.4</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>		A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.7	61.4	62.5	0.70%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.3	10.3	8.8	0.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.3	4.3	4.4	0.00%					<p>These data represent progress for 5A and remain unchanged for 5B and 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for 5C but did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5B.</p>
	<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>																							
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	60.7	61.4	62.5	0.70%																						
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.3	10.3	8.8	0.00%																						
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.3	4.3	4.4	0.00%																						
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.					The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.																				
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	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised its FFY 2010 targets. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and the revised targets for FFY 2010. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:					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																				

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<p>data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<p>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	81.3	79.5	82.0		
<p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	80.7	77.9	81.0		
<p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	82.1	80.2	83.0		
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		
<p>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	51.6	50.5	52.0		
<p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	54.8	52.5	55.0		
<p>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	69.9	66.7	71.0		
<p>The State provided revised baseline data using FFY 2009 data, therefore OSEP is not comparing FFY 2009 data to FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet the FFY 2009 targets.</p>					
<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</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 revised its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and the revised targets for FFY 2010. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the</p>				

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>previously-established targets. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 64.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 67.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 70%. In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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. [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. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .2%. The FFY 2008 data were 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%. The State reported that 13 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that 101 of 488 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 20 students with IEPs in the racial and ethnic category of interest and were excluded from the calculation. The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected. Although the State was not required to report on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, the State reported that it corrected all noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 demonstrating compliance.</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. [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. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%. The State reported that 32 districts were identified with disproportionate representation</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012 demonstrating compliance.</p>

Minnesota 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 racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 239 of 488 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 20 students with IEPs in the racial and ethnic and disability category of interest and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that the seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected. Although the State was not required to report on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, the State reported that it corrected all noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</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 95.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 94.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 41 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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. 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>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>

Minnesota 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: (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. [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 96.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 18 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 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>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</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 58.8%.</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>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

<p align="center">Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</p>	<p align="center">Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</p>	<p align="center">OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</p>
<p>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 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 verify the correction.</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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 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 and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State also submitted targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on those targets. OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State’s end target for FFY 2012 for Indicator 14C (77.6%) does not reflect improvement over the baseline data (77.6%). The State must revise its FFY 2012 target for Indicator 14C to reflect improvement.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 29.8% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 61.9% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 77.6% 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>With the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes the target for 14C reflecting improvement over the State’s baseline data.</p> <p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</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 93.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,155 of 1,230 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 75 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to provide certain information related to the verification of correction and regarding fiscal findings of noncompliance by July 30, 2010. The State submitted the required</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	information.	<p>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 4A, 4B, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 the State 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	<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 represent</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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 three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 64%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation 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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.5%. These data represent</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Minnesota Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	progress from the FFY 2008 data of 87.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 75 - 85%.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 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.</p>