

**Minnesota 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 86.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 85.0%.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 4.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4.3%.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 56.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 66.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 72.6%.</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 with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. The FFY 2009 data were 97.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 95%.</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 reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<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>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 266 674 337">Grade</th> <th data-bbox="674 266 821 337">FFY 2009 Data</th> <th data-bbox="821 266 968 337">FFY 2010 Data</th> <th data-bbox="968 266 1115 337">FFY 2010 Target</th> <th data-bbox="1115 266 1262 337">FFY 2009 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1262 266 1409 337">FFY 2010 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1409 266 1583 337">FFY 2010 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="821 337 1115 380">Reading</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="1262 337 1583 380">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 380 674 422">3</td> <td data-bbox="674 380 821 422">61.2%</td> <td data-bbox="821 380 968 422">64.6%</td> <td data-bbox="968 380 1115 422">84.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 380 1262 422">80.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 380 1409 422">65.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 380 1583 422">88.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 422 674 464">4</td> <td data-bbox="674 422 821 464">65.9%</td> <td data-bbox="821 422 968 464">65.6%</td> <td data-bbox="968 422 1115 464">82.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 422 1262 464">71.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 422 1409 464">60.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 422 1583 464">88.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 464 674 506">5</td> <td data-bbox="674 464 821 506">68.9%</td> <td data-bbox="821 464 968 506">74.4%</td> <td data-bbox="968 464 1115 506">84.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 464 1262 506">61.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 464 1409 506">53.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 464 1583 506">77.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 506 674 548">6</td> <td data-bbox="674 506 821 548">63.6%</td> <td data-bbox="821 506 968 548">67.6%</td> <td data-bbox="968 506 1115 548">83.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 506 1262 548">59.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 506 1409 548">47.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 506 1583 548">77.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 548 674 591">7</td> <td data-bbox="674 548 821 591">55.5%</td> <td data-bbox="821 548 968 591">63.0%</td> <td data-bbox="968 548 1115 591">80.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 548 1262 591">52.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 548 1409 591">51.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 548 1583 591">76.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 591 674 633">8</td> <td data-bbox="674 591 821 633">55.6%</td> <td data-bbox="821 591 968 633">63.9%</td> <td data-bbox="968 591 1115 633">79.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 591 1262 633">41.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 591 1409 633">46.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 591 1583 633">76.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 633 674 675">HS</td> <td data-bbox="674 633 821 675">64.9%</td> <td data-bbox="821 633 968 675">69.1%</td> <td data-bbox="968 633 1115 675">79.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1115 633 1262 675">25.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 633 1409 675">33.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1409 633 1583 675">60.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	Grade	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target		Reading			Math			3	61.2%	64.6%	84.1%	80.7%	65.9%	88.0%	4	65.9%	65.6%	82.6%	71.8%	60.2%	88.6%	5	68.9%	74.4%	84.0%	61.6%	53.9%	77.0%	6	63.6%	67.6%	83.0%	59.1%	47.7%	77.1%	7	55.5%	63.0%	80.4%	52.4%	51.1%	76.5%	8	55.6%	63.9%	79.5%	41.9%	46.8%	76.2%	HS	64.9%	69.1%	79.9%	25.7%	33.5%	60.0%	<p>State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	61.2%	64.6%	84.1%	80.7%	65.9%	88.0%																																																											
4	65.9%	65.6%	82.6%	71.8%	60.2%	88.6%																																																											
5	68.9%	74.4%	84.0%	61.6%	53.9%	77.0%																																																											
6	63.6%	67.6%	83.0%	59.1%	47.7%	77.1%																																																											
7	55.5%	63.0%	80.4%	52.4%	51.1%	76.5%																																																											
8	55.6%	63.9%	79.5%	41.9%	46.8%	76.2%																																																											
HS	64.9%	69.1%	79.9%	25.7%	33.5%	60.0%																																																											
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.0%. The State’s FFY 2009 data are 0.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 1.4%.</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 457 of 487 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.</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 did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2009 whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

**Minnesota 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 last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding 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); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 466 of 487 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 10 children with IEPs, and a total of at least 5 children with IEPs in the racial/ethnic category of interest who were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days.</p> <p>The State reported that 21 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 two districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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</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 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<p>§300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2009 (based on FFY 2008 data) whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding 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); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, 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>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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for 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 1015 1583 1489"> <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">61.4</td> <td align="center">61.3</td> <td align="center">62.5</td> <td align="center">-0.10%</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">4.2</td> <td align="center">4.0</td> <td align="center">0.10%</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	61.4	61.3	62.5	-0.10%	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	4.2	4.0	0.10%	<p>OSEP 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	61.4	61.3	62.5	-0.10%																		
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	4.2	4.0	0.10%																		

**Minnesota 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>																								
	These data represent progress for Indicator 5C and remain unchanged for Indicator 5B from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.																									
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 862 1583 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 862 957 964"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 862 1163 964"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 862 1373 964"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 862 1583 964"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 964 957 1101"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 964 1163 1101">79.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 964 1373 1101">75.8</td> <td data-bbox="1373 964 1583 1101">80.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1101 957 1268"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1101 1163 1268">77.9</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1101 1373 1268">75.0</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1101 1583 1268">81.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1268 957 1370"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1268 1163 1370">80.2</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1268 1373 1370">76.4</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1268 1583 1370">81.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1370 957 1472"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 1370 1163 1472"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1370 1373 1472"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1370 1583 1472"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1472 957 1503"><b>Outcome A:</b></td> <td data-bbox="957 1472 1163 1503">50.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1472 1373 1503">53.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1472 1583 1503">51.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<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) (%)	79.5	75.8	80.0	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	77.9	75.0	81.0	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	80.2	76.4	81.0	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</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>	50.5	53.1	51.0	<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>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) (%)	79.5	75.8	80.0																							
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	77.9	75.0	81.0																							
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	80.2	76.4	81.0																							
<b><u>Summary Statement 2</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>	50.5	53.1	51.0																							

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)				
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	52.5	54.0	53.0	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	66.7	65.0	69.0	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
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.  [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 64.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 70%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the corrected FFY 2009 data (The State reported that it did not identify findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 and its reported data of 0.2% was in error). The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 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 97 of 488 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 20 students with disabilities in each racial and ethnicity</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	category.	
<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 revised the improvement activities for 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 are unchanged from the updated FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 25 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 229 of 488 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 20 students with disabilities in each racial and ethnicity category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 95.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 52 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State 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 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95.7%. The FFY 2009 data were 96.1%. 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 2009 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 2011 APR, 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 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</p>

**Minnesota 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>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 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 57.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 58.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 140 of 145 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that four findings were subsequently corrected by</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</p>

**Minnesota 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>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>February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>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 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2009 was corrected.																				
<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 revised the improvement activities for 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="548 565 1583 1105"> <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">29.1</td> <td align="center">33.0</td> <td align="center">29.1</td> <td align="center">3.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">61.9</td> <td align="center">62.8</td> <td align="center">61.9</td> <td align="center">0.90%</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">77.6</td> <td align="center">79.7</td> <td align="center">77.7</td> <td align="center">2.10%</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 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	29.1	33.0	29.1	3.90%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61.9	62.8	61.9	0.90%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	77.6	79.7	77.7	2.10%	<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	29.1	33.0	29.1	3.90%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61.9	62.8	61.9	0.90%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	77.6	79.7	77.7	2.10%																		
<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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 93.9%. 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 the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY</p>																				

**Minnesota 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>
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State reported that 2,156 of 2,210 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 50 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter required the State to report in its FFY 2010 APR on the correction of any findings of noncompliance that it was required to make as a result of the required actions identified in the General Supervision Critical Elements 1 and 2 sections of that letter. (For Part B, such findings were to be based on noncompliance discovered through fiscal monitoring in FFY 2008 and FFY 2009). The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p>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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining four uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected.</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 the four uncorrected findings 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 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>

**Minnesota 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>
		Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 11, 12, and 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 94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 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 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 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. 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 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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 65%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Minnesota 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>
[Results Indicator]	Resolution data until July 2012.	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 91.5%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 80-90%.</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>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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. 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>