

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data are 52.6%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 53.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 74.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data are 19.7%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 7.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of less than or equal to 26%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 92.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 96.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of greater than or equal to 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 33.6% for reading and 42.5% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 33.3% for reading and the FFY 2005 data of 42.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of greater than or equal to 33% for reading and greater than or equal to 39% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.30%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0.68%. The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of equal to or less than 1.25%.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table and OSEP's November 22, 2006 verification visit letter, the State provided information demonstrating that the State has a plan to address the accuracy of its suspension/expulsion data.</p> <p>The State did not provide, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response letter, a description of how it reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported that it notified the one LEA identified in FFY 2006 as having a significant discrepancy that it must examine its data and submit an action plan specifying how the LEA will review its</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>policies, procedures, and practices. The State also reported that, beginning in February 2008, any LEA identified with a significant discrepancy will be required to examine their data and submit an action plan, as described above. It appears that the State has failed to conduct (or require the relevant LEAs to conduct) such a review of policies, procedures and practices in those LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with significant discrepancies, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State must demonstrate correction of this noncompliance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]																										
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data in the APR for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 483 1419 862"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>60.35%</td> <td>62.29%</td> <td>60.37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>15.32%</td> <td>13.35%</td> <td>15.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.24%</td> <td>2.09%</td> <td>1.22%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, the State's FFY 2006 data under IDEA section 618 for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 963 1419 1265"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 618 Data</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>61.92%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>13.27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.39%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The 618 data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	60.35%	62.29%	60.37%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	15.32%	13.35%	15.3%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.24%	2.09%	1.22%		FFY 2006 618 Data	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.92%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.27%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.39%	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																							
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	60.35%	62.29%	60.37%																							
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	15.32%	13.35%	15.3%																							
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.24%	2.09%	1.22%																							
	FFY 2006 618 Data																									
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.92%																									
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.27%																									
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.39%																									
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																									

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>																										
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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; New]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 565 1419 1252"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 565 1062 737">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 565 1182 737">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 565 1302 737">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 565 1419 737">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 737 1062 812">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 737 1182 812">10.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 737 1302 812">8.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 737 1419 812">13.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 812 1062 943">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 812 1182 943">44.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 812 1302 943">64.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 812 1419 943">55.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 943 1062 1045">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 943 1182 1045">10.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 943 1302 1045">19.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 943 1419 1045">.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1045 1062 1148">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1045 1182 1148">3.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1045 1302 1148">1.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1045 1419 1148">2.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1148 1062 1252">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1148 1182 1252">31.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1148 1302 1252">6.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1148 1419 1252">28.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	10.0%	8.5%	13.5%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	44.1%	64.2%	55.7%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	10.4%	19.4%	.4%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	3.9%	1.7%	2.1%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.6%	6.2%	28.3%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	10.0%	8.5%	13.5%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	44.1%	64.2%	55.7%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	10.4%	19.4%	.4%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	3.9%	1.7%	2.1%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.6%	6.2%	28.3%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.6%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the</p>																								

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88.0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 88.2%.</p>	<p>State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2006 data are representative.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 response table indicated that the State's sampling plan for this indicator was not technically sound. The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it does yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. This data serves as the State's revised baseline.</p> <p>The State met its target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that one district was identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's recalculation of the data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided information that demonstrated that it examined the data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, in compliance with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3).</p> <p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation and recalculated the data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 using this new definition to report data for the FFY 2006 reporting period. The State did not recalculate the data from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 for the FFY 2005 reporting period, therefore, the 0% reported for FFY 2006 is now the State's revised baseline data. The State should clarify, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and in its SPP, that the recalculated data for FFY 2006 is the revised baseline data.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State reported that two of the three LEAs identified in FFY 2006, based on the recalculated data from FFY 2006 and FFY 2005, as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification were the result of residential facility students that resided outside of the LEA prior to being placed into the treatment facility and that by removing these “out of district” residential treatment facilities from the LEA’s data, the two LEAs no longer met the criteria for disproportionate identification. Upon the review of policies, practices and procedures of the third LEA, the State determined that disproportionate representation based on FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 data for American Indians was not due to inappropriate identification.</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 its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised its baseline for this indicator in its SPP; however, OSEP cannot accept that revision because the data are not valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts (14/337 or 4.15%) in FFY 2006, based on data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Although the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, it did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in all of those districts. The State’s data are not consistent with the measurement for this indicator and therefore, are not valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State did not, as required by OSEP’s June 15, 2007 response to its FFY</p>	<p>As required by OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided information that it examined the data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and that it examined the data for all race ethnicity categories in the State.</p> <p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation and recalculated the data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 using this new definition. Based on its recalculation, the State reported that 4.15%</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2005 SPP, submit baseline data nor did it complete a review of the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>(14 LEAs) were found to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State reported that seven of those 14 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, but that the assessment on the remaining seven districts would not be completed until May 2008. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must submit revised baseline data for FFY 2006 based on a complete analysis of the data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that it has in effect policies, procedures and practices as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 85.9%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 baseline data of 85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report on the timely correction of noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 regarding the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 APRs.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.4%. However, these data are not valid or reliable because, as reported by the State, the current data collection method does not enable the State to determine the date on which services are to start thereby ensuring that an IEP is developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. The State indicated that its data system changes will result in valid and reliable data in the FFY 2007 APR. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if the State timely corrected prior findings of noncompliance (identified in FFY 2005) because the State did not report on the timely correction of noncompliance.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided data regarding the range of days beyond the third birthday for children for whom an IEP was not implemented by the third birthday.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 regarding the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must provide valid and reliable data for this indicator in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 17.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if the State timely corrected prior findings of noncompliance (identified in FFY 2005) because the State did not report on the timely correction of noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required raw data for this indicator. The State provided the required data in its FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 regarding the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 70.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the State reported 100% timely correction for this indicator, the State acknowledged that these data were based only on findings of noncompliance from complaint investigations and findings of noncompliance/verifications of corrective action; although the State collected data showing noncompliance in FFY 2005, the State did not issue any written letters of noncompliance to LEAs in either FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 and thus, made no monitoring findings.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report measurable data for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State's data are not valid and reliable data. Although the State's FFY 2006 reported data of 100% met the State's FFY 2006 target of 100%, as noted above those data were based only on findings of noncompliance from complaint investigations and findings of noncompliance/verifications of corrective action.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, including data on correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. OSEP's FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table also noted the State's failure to provide data related to the correction of the prior noncompliance identified in OSEP's written verification visit letter, dated November 22, 2006.</p> <p>As noted in OSEP's verification visit letter, the State's FFY 2006 APR demonstrates that the general supervision system is not effective at identifying noncompliance with Part B. The State reported that it could not provide data of correction because the State did not conduct any follow-through or analysis of the data submitted by the LEAs, nor did the State issue any letters of noncompliance to the LEAs for FFY 2005 or FFY 2006. The State only reported on correction of findings of noncompliance from complaint investigations.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's effort in timely correcting noncompliance identified under this indicator with regard to findings of noncompliance from complaint investigations</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and findings of noncompliance/verifications of corrective action. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of its general supervision systems. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide complete data consistent with the measurement for this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance in this table under those indicators.</p>
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Indiana Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 30.32%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 30.4%.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 82.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 52%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 52.4%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 85.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. Although the State reported that it met its FFY 2006 target of 100%, the State's FFY 2006 data under Indicators 10, 12 and 15 do not reflect the measurement.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §76.720 and 300.601(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.