

Minnesota

Table A – Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>The State did not, as required by the instructions for Indicator 1 in the SPP, provide a narrative description of the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. 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 standards. C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>In its SPP, the State explained that it was using data from 2003-2004 as its baseline for Indicator 3A, as it did not believe "that the data from 2004-2005 is valid since it appears to be falsely elevated due to Safe Harbor effects." The State further indicated that, "When the new data on the percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for the disability subgroup is available from the 2005-2006 school year, an analysis of the data trends will be completed and the baseline will be adjusted if necessary. The targets listed for this indicator have been developed based upon a baseline of 2003-2004."</p>	<p>The State must include updated data from FFY 2005 (i.e., July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006) for Indicator 3A in the APR, due February 1, 2007. The State should review the targets it set in the SPP for Indicator 3A in light of those updated data, and determine whether it is appropriate to revise the targets.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish entry level data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, the State also needs to explain how it addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly.</p>
<p>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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State did not provide the required baseline data regarding the percentage 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>On page 53 of the SPP, the State reported that the Minnesota Department of Education (which is both the State education agency and the Lead Agency for Part C) "... has developed and is now implementing a new process to collect data on the transition of children with disabilities as they turn 3. This process utilizes the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) and requires [local education agencies (LEAs)] to create a new enrollment record for children as they turn three in order to more carefully document the continuation of service for these children."</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that address the required measure for Indicator 12. Failure to include these data may affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State reported a 97.4% level of compliance for Indicator 16 in the SPP, specifically the requirement at 34 CFR §300.661(a) and (b)(1). While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p>