

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table

Part B SPP/APR Indicators

| |
|--|
| 1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator] |
| 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator] |
| 3. 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator] |
| 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; [Results Indicator] 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. [Compliance Indicator] |
| 5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator] |
| 6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New] |
| 7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator] |
| 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] |
| 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] |

| |
|--|
| 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] |
| 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. [Compliance Indicator] |
| 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] |
| 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. [Compliance Indicator] |
| 14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; 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. [Results Indicator] |
| 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. [Compliance Indicator] |
| 18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator] |
| 19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator] |
| 20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator] |

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 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.

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

| INDICATOR | FFY 2010 DATA | FFY 2011 DATA | FFY 2011 TARGET |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Graduation | 72.33% | 56.57% | ≥ 90% ¹ |
| 2. Drop Out | 4.46% | 5.41% | ≤ 3.27% ² |
| 3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AMO for Disability Subgroup | | 48% | New Baseline |
| B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading | 99.1% | 99.17% | ≥ 95% |
| B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math | 99.23% | 99.05% | ≥ 95% |
| C. Proficiency Rate | See Attached Table | See Attached Table | See Attached Table |
| 4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion | 16.7% | 16.7% | ≤ 8.3% |
| 5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21 | | | |
| A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day | 66.14% | 67.12% | ≥ 62.61% |
| B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day | 14.04% | 13.66% | ≤ 15.36% |
| C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals | 7.12% | 7.01% | ≤ 6.32% |
| 6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending: | | | |
| A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program; | | 63.6% | Baseline |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. | | 19.6% | Baseline |
| 7. Preschool Outcomes | See Attached Table | See Attached Table | See Attached Table |
| 8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement-School Age | 40% | 42% | ≥ 36% |
| Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement-Pre School | 49% | 49% | ≥ 39% |
| 14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School: | | | |
| A. Enrolled in Higher Education | 29.36% | 24.94% | ≥ 50% |
| B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed | 50.17% | 57.79% | ≥ 73% |
| C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment | 62.73% | 85.99% | ≥ 82% |
| 18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements | 64.2% | 70.5% | ≥ 64-75% |
| 19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements | 77.7% | 76.6% | ≥ 75-85% |

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

² As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

3.C. Statewide Assessments:

Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

| Grade | FFY 2010 Data | FFY 2011 Data | FFY 2011 Target | FFY 2010 Data | FFY 2011 Data | FFY 2011 Target |
|-------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | Reading | Reading | Reading | Math | Math | Math |
| 3 | 68% | 69.34% | ≥ 83.64% | 62.7% | 63.37% | ≥ 85.65% |
| 4 | 71.5% | 71.47% | ≥ 88.45% | 67% | 66.09% | ≥ 85.57% |
| 5 | 70.3% | 72.27% | ≥ 85.68% | 57.6% | 61.01% | ≥ 82.38% |
| 6 | 59.4% | 57.82% | ≥ 86.50% | 54.1% | 54.13% | ≥ 79.36% |
| 7 | 57.3% | 51.96% | ≥ 85.75% | 48.7% | 49.68% | ≥ 78.49% |
| 8 | 55.1% | 52.24% | ≥ 84.45% | 34.9% | 37.96% | ≥ 77.91% |
| HS | 49.8% | 51.56% | ≥ 79.50% | 48.6% | 48.33% | ≥ 73.67% |

7. Percent of Preschool Children Age 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

| Summary Statement 1³ | FFY 2010 Data | FFY 2011 Data | FFY 2011 Target |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | 68.9% | 69.2% | ≥ 68.9% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) | 69.5% | 70.4% | ≥ 69.5% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | 63.9% | 65.52% | ≥ 63.9% |
| Summary Statement 2⁴ | FFY 2010 Data | FFY 2011 Data | FFY 2011 Target |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | 67.5% | 69.53% | ≥ 67.5% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) | 55.2% | 60.38% | ≥ 55.2% |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | 63.6% | 67% | ≥ 63.6% |

³ **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

⁴ **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 Results Data Summary Notes

| |
|--|
| <p>INDICATOR 1: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 2: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 3A: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State has reported FFY 2011 baseline data for this indicator based on Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).</p> <p>The State is reporting AMO data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as a result of ESEA flexibility.</p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 3B: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> |
| <p>INDICATOR 3C: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> |

INDICATOR 4A: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that four 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 20 of the 24 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 discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State identified noncompliance through this review.

The State reported that it revised (or required the affected district to revise), the district’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.

For the district 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 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.

In addition, the State reported that one of two remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected and the one remaining finding was in a district that is under a Court Approved Settlement Agreement.

INDICATOR 4A:

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2011 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.⁵ In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2012 APR that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).

INDICATOR 6: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data, targets for FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator. The State reported that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2012.

INDICATOR 7:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.

INDICATOR 14: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

⁵ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (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.

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Compliance Summary

| INDICATOR | FFY 2010 DATA | FFY 2011 DATA | FFY 2011 TARGET | CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| 4B. Significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements | 4.1% | 0% | 0% | The State reported that the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 was corrected in a timely manner. |
| 9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. | 0% | 0% | 0% | The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010. |
| 10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | 0% | 0% | 0% | The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010. |
| 11. Timely Initial Evaluation | 97.71% | 97.79% | 100% | The State reported that 22 Of 23 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by February 15, 2013. |
| 12. Early Childhood Transition | 99.17% | 99.89% | 100% | The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner. |
| 13. Secondary Transition | 95.27% | 97.5% | 100% | The State reported that all 429 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner. |

| INDICATOR | FFY 2010 DATA | FFY 2011 DATA | FFY 2011 TARGET | CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010 |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|--|
| 15. Timely Correction | 97.51% | 98.08% | 100% | The State reported that 1,789 of 1,824 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that 34 findings were subsequently corrected by February 15, 2013. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. |
| 20. Timely and Accurate Data | 95.45% | 97.82% | 100% | |

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

| REQUIREMENT | FFY 2010 DATA | FFY 2011 DATA |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Timely resolution of complaints | 100% | 98.8% |
| Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests | 100% | 100% |

Maryland Part B FFY 2011 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that four 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.

The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.

The State reported that 20 of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 children with disabilities in a particular race/ethnic group suspended for greater than ten days.”

For districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 whose policies, procedures, and practices were reviewed, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b), the State did not report 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.

The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner. The State also reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §200.170(b) was subsequently corrected.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State did not report the results of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010.

INDICATOR 9: The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that three of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 10: The State reported that 16 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.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that 20 of 24 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 and were excluded from the calculation.

INDICATOR 11:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 12:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 13:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (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 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15: The State reported that 1,789 of 1,824 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner and that 34 of 35 findings were subsequently corrected by February 15, 2013, and reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.

The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 was corrected. The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected, and the one remaining finding was in a district that is under a Court Approved Settlement Agreement. The State reported that one of the two remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected, and the one remaining finding was in a district that is under a Court Approved Settlement Agreement.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2012 APR that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2011 APR was corrected.

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and the remaining findings 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 2012 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 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

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 2012 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.

The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2012 APR, that it has corrected the remaining finding identified in FFY 2005. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2012 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2012 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 the remaining finding of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2011 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.

Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.