

**Massachusetts 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. [Results 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 are 64.1%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 64.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 72.5%.</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 looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, 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. [Results 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 are 4.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4.7%.</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 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 are 49% for English Language Arts and 31% for Math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 43.8% for English Language Arts and slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 33.7% for Math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 52% for English Language Arts and 45% for Math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</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 are 98.4% for English Language Arts and 98.6% for Math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.1% for English Language Arts and 98.2% for Math. The State did not meet its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Massachusetts 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>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2010 targets of 99% for English Language Arts and 99% for Math. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, a link demonstrating that it met reporting requirements in 34 CFR §300.160(f) for the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the district and school levels. The State provided this information.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results 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. The State reported on this indicator by providing a Composite Proficiency Index (CPI) for students with disabilities. The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 68.3 CPI for English Language Arts and 57.7 CPI for Math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 67.3 CPI for English Language Arts and 57.5 CPI for Math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 95.1 CPI for English Language Arts and 92.2 CPI for Math. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2010 reported data are 0.56%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 0.57%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State reported that two 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. The State reported that 32 of 392 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 students with disabilities. 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</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. 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). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly</p>

**Massachusetts 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>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 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p>	<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</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 are 0%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 0.8% because the State identified three districts as having 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 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. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 391 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 20 students with IEPs in at least one racial/ethnicity group.</p> <p>The State reported that seven 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</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 for this indicator. 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</p>

**Massachusetts 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>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 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 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>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> <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>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>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 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1284 1583 1487"> <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">57</td> <td align="center">57.9</td> <td align="center">58</td> <td align="center">0.90%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<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	57	57.9	58	0.90%	<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	57	57.9	58	0.90%								

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15.4	15.1	14.5	0.30%	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.7	6.7	5.5	0.00%	
	These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 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>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 facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.					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>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>	<p>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 reported data for this indicator are:</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>		
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	81.6	76.9	82		
	<b>Outcome B:</b>	82.4	76.6	83		

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	82.8	78.9	84.5	
	<u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	52.2	53.3	75	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	55.3	56.8	75	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	64.8	65.2	75	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet 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 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 are 83%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 80%.</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's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, data for this indicator. The State provided all of the required information.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Massachusetts 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 State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</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 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 are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that all 393 districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 20 students for at least one racial/ethnic group.</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. [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 are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 33 of 393 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students for at least one racial/ethnic disability group.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the State</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 96.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 data for this indicator.</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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 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>

**Massachusetts 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>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 are 86.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data was not corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it is taking to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 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 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 are 99.1%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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 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 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 it has verified that 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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 them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1583 1373"> <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">42.3</td> <td align="center">50.7</td> <td align="center">43</td> <td align="center">8.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">72</td> <td align="center">79.8</td> <td align="center">74</td> <td align="center">7.80%</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">81.3</td> <td align="center">88.9</td> <td align="center">82</td> <td align="center">7.60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	42.3	50.7	43	8.4%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72	79.8	74	7.80%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	81.3	88.9	82	7.60%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	42.3	50.7	43	8.4%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	72	79.8	74	7.80%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	81.3	88.9	82	7.60%																		

**Massachusetts 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>
	was representative of the population.	
<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 100%. This data represents progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.2%. The State met its target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 632 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 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, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the</p>

**Massachusetts 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>
		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 99%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 100%. 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 appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 94.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 94.4%. 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 61.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 55.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 48-58%.</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>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 87.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 86.8%. The State met</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011</p>

**Massachusetts 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>resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>its FFY 2010 target of 75-86%. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.7%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 97.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</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 and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). 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. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>