

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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.<br/>[Results Indicator]</p>  | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 69.72%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 58.95%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of a one percent improvement over the prior year (i.e., 59.95%).</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>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.<br/>[Results Indicator]</p>   | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 15.93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 26.99%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of <math>\leq 23\%</math>.</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>  |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:<br/>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.<br/>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.25%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.74%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of <math>\geq 94.5\%</math>.</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>  |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:<br/>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.<br/>[Results Indicator]</p>   | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.87% for reading and 96.60% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 96% for reading and 96% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of <math>\geq 95\%</math>.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>  |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of</p>  | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 49.99% for reading and</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p>  |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>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>56.90% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 43% for reading and 51% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of <math>\geq 37\%</math> for reading and <math>\geq 43\%</math> for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>   | <p>efforts to improve performance.</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 revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.45%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of <math>\leq 1.50\%</math>.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that five districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 282 of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten or more students with disabilities.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise) the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected. However, as the State reported in its FFY 2009 APR, these were findings issued in FFY 2009 (January 29, 2010), based on FFY 2008 data. The State reported on</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, based on FFY 2008 data, as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each district noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and each district with remaining 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</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>   | <p>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). If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.</p>   |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:<br/>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.<br/>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.31%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</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 reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State also reported that eight 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 288 of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten or more students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>category.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner, and that four findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> | <p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 is correctly implementing the</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators   | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues  | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps   |                        |                      |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
|--|---|--|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|-------|-------|---------|-------|--|-------|-------|---------|--------|--|------|------|--------|-------|--|
|  |   | specific regulatory requirement(s). If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. |                        |                      |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
| <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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 613 1583 1089"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">64.89</td> <td align="center">67.86</td> <td align="center">≥ 60.40</td> <td align="center">2.97%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">12.51</td> <td align="center">12.60</td> <td align="center">≤ 15.27</td> <td align="center">-0.09%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.46</td> <td align="center">2.25</td> <td align="center">≤ 1.19</td> <td align="center">0.21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p> |  | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 64.89 | 67.86 | ≥ 60.40 | 2.97% | B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 12.51 | 12.60 | ≤ 15.27 | -0.09% | C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 2.46 | 2.25 | ≤ 1.19 | 0.21% | <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 2011 APR.</p> |
|  | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>  | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u>      |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
| A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day   | 64.89   | 67.86  | ≥ 60.40                | 2.97%                |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
| B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day   | 12.51   | 12.60  | ≤ 15.27                | -0.09%               |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
| C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements   | 2.46  | 2.25   | ≤ 1.19                 | 0.21%                |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |
| <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 regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential</p>      | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>   | <p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>  |                        |                      |                        |                 |  |       |       |         |       |  |       |       |         |        |  |      |      |        |       |  |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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> |                        |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
|---|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|-------|-------|-----|--|-----|-------|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|-----|---|
| facility.<br>[Results Indicator; New]   |  |                                 |                        |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| 7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:<br><br>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);<br>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and<br>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.<br><br>[Results Indicator] | The State's reported data for this indicator are:<br><br><table border="1" data-bbox="552 431 1583 1446"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b><br/>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">66.1%</td> <td align="center">64.2%</td> <td align="center">53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b><br/>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">65%</td> <td align="center">72.6%</td> <td align="center">66%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b><br/>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">63.1%</td> <td align="center">74.5%</td> <td align="center">77.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b><br/>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">36.1%</td> <td align="center">20.4%</td> <td align="center">41.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b><br/>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">32.4%</td> <td align="center">15.4%</td> <td align="center">48.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b><br/>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">31.5%</td> <td align="center">16.9%</td> <td align="center">65%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State | <u>Summary Statement 1</u>      | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <b>Outcome A:</b><br>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 66.1% | 64.2% | 53% | <b>Outcome B:</b><br>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 65% | 72.6% | 66% | <b>Outcome C:</b><br>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 63.1% | 74.5% | 77.5% | <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <b>Outcome A:</b><br>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 36.1% | 20.4% | 41.5% | <b>Outcome B:</b><br>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 32.4% | 15.4% | 48.5% | <b>Outcome C:</b><br>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 31.5% | 16.9% | 65% | OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.<br><br>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR. |
| <u>Summary Statement 1</u>  | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u>            | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome A:</b><br>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)  | 66.1%  | 64.2%                           | 53%                    |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome B:</b><br>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)  | 65%  | 72.6%                           | 66%                    |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome C:</b><br>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)   | 63.1%  | 74.5%                           | 77.5%                  |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <u>Summary Statement 2</u>  | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u>            | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome A:</b><br>Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)  | 36.1%  | 20.4%                           | 41.5%                  |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome B:</b><br>Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)  | 32.4%  | 15.4%                           | 48.5%                  |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |
| <b>Outcome C:</b><br>Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)   | 31.5%  | 16.9%                           | 65%                    |                      |                        |  |       |       |     |  |     |       |     |   |       |       |       |                            |                      |                      |                        |  |       |       |       |  |       |       |       |   |       |       |     |   |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>  |
|---|---|--|
|   | changed the instrument it used to collect the data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 69.60%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the survey used to collect the data for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 42.4%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>  |
| <p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>                   | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that 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 25 of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students in a given population.</p>   | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>  |
| <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>                          | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.18%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 56 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 11 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 57 of 346 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students in a given population.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State,</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether the districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, based on FFY 2009 data, was the result of inappropriate</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>within 90 days of receipt of the response table, to provide a copy of its monitoring procedures demonstrating that the State verifies correction of noncompliance under this indicator consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State provided all of the required information in its September 19, 2011 letter to OSEP.</p> | <p>identification. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2011 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was not 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 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008, and the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007, were corrected. The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps  |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                      |  | <p>report, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has corrected the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2008 and the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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.<br/>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.96%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.80%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that</p>   |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 84.05%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 80.22%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 68 of 77 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p>   |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>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>identified FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining nine uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>  |                        |                      |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
|---|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|---|------|------|------|-------|---|------|------|------|---------|--|
|   |  | them, if necessary to ensure compliance.   |                        |                      |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
| <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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 412 1583 954"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">34.3</td> <td align="center">32.5</td> <td align="center">34.8</td> <td align="center">-1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">49.1</td> <td align="center">56.4</td> <td align="center">49.1</td> <td align="center">7.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">86.1</td> <td align="center">76.1</td> <td align="center">86.6</td> <td align="center">-10.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 14B and slippage for 14A and 14C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 14B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 14A and 14C.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> |  | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Enrolled in higher education | 34.3 | 32.5 | 34.8 | -1.80% | B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 49.1 | 56.4 | 49.1 | 7.30% | C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 86.1 | 76.1 | 86.6 | -10.00% | <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 2011 APR.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p> |
|   | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u>   | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u>      |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
| A. % Enrolled in higher education   | 34.3   | 32.5   | 34.8                   | -1.80%               |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
| B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed   | 49.1   | 56.4   | 49.1                   | 7.30%                |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
| C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed   | 86.1   | 76.1   | 86.6                   | -10.00%              |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |
| <p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>  | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 89.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 128 of 143 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that one finding was subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that four of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008</p>   | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR, were corrected.</p> |                        |                      |                        |                 |                                   |      |      |      |        |   |      |      |      |       |   |      |      |      |         |  |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was not corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> | <p>The State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State’s general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has corrected the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2008 and the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State’s explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.</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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 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>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) are 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) have 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12, and</p> |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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>  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 77.78%. These data are based on nine due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 83.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 66%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 31%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>   | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>   |

**Indiana Part B FFY 2010 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.<br/>[Results Indicator]</p>  | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 59.38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 53%.<br/><br/>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>   |
| <p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.<br/>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.<br/><br/>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.62%. The State met its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> |