

IN
Part B

FFY2017
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

The Indiana State Education Agency (SEA) is the Indiana Department of Education. The Office of Special Education (IDOE/OSE) is part of the IDOE/Academics Division. The SEA offers support to IDOE/OSE through ancillary divisions such as Finance, Communications, General Counsel, Government Affairs and School Support Services. Please visit the Indiana website at <http://www.doe.in.gov/> for an organizational chart.

IDOE/OSE has strengthened relationships between various offices such as School Improvement, Assessment, Title Programs and Educator Effectiveness through work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (Indicator 17).

Indiana appreciates the direction outlined in the U.S. Department of Education Assistant Secretary Johnny Collett's *Framework for Special Education on Rehabilitative Services Priorities - Raising expectations and improving outcomes for individuals with disabilities*. IDOE/OSE, based on the Every Student Succeed Act and the OSEP Dear Colleague letter on the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education has established the foundation for the 'Every Student Succeeds initiative. This initiative is represented via an infographic that contains the following key provisions:

- 1) Central is the philosophy 'equity plus access equals outcomes'
- 2) This is achieved through the tenets of high expectations, shared accountability and shared responsibility
- 3) Supporting those tenets are collaboration, instruction, assessment and curriculum
- 4) The overall system is supported through an environment of Universal Design for Learning and a Multi Tiered System of Supports

In November 2018 Indiana made LEA determinations based upon a Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system which includes differentiated support. Results indicators and other results data, compliance indicators and data timeliness are components and the cornerstone of RDA. Each of these components are then made up of specific elements which are assigned points dependent upon whether a target is met. These points are part of a calculation by which the LEA determination is assigned and differentiated support is decided. This has been a multi-year project developed and implemented on the input and advice of stakeholders from throughout Indiana.

The IDOE/OSE has nineteen dedicated staff members that provide general supervision to the state. These staff are members of three teams (Fiscal, Due Process, and, Monitoring).

Indiana also has the Indiana Resource Network, made up of technical assistance entities that provide training and technical assistance, working directly with LEA staff across the state.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

394

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The IDOE/OSE has nineteen dedicated staff members that provide general supervision to the state. Staff includes:

Administration

Director (1)

Assistant Director (2)

Due Process Coordinator/Special Education Attorney (1)

Due Process Team

Due Process Coordinator/Special Education Attorney (Also part of administration)

Complaint Investigator (3)

Fiscal Team

- Assistant Director (Also part of administration)
- Grants and Medicaid Specialist (1)
- Grants and Contracts Specialist (1)
- Excess Cost Supervisor (1)
- Excess Costs and Part B Grants Specialist (1)
- Excess Cost Support Specialist (1)
- Fiscal Support Specialist (1)

Monitoring Team

- Assistant Director (Also part of administration)
- Education Specialist (4)
- Data Manager (1)

As a result of a long and productive working relationship with the Parent Training and Information Center, IDOE is one of a few states, if not the only state, that provides office space for a staff member from our parent resource center, IN*SOURCE, which helps to facilitate a close working relationship between the two entities. The IN*SOURCE staff member is an integral part of IDOE/OSE, attending IDOE/OSE staff meetings and is asked to speak to family members who call in with questions.

Following the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), corresponding regulations, and, Article 7, (Indiana's special education rules), IDOE/OSE personnel are to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE) so they can be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.

The IDOE/OSE 'system of general supervision' is a cohesive, coordinated set of the activities described below. It is important to note that though personnel have an assigned 'area of responsibility,' work is not done in isolation. Staff work closely with one another as each is dependent upon the others for updates, sharing of information, and communication of issues that impact the entire office. The IDOE/OSE routinely engages in cross-training of team members. For example, each of the due process, fiscal and monitoring staff members are also leading or are part of specific project teams, answering general inquiries on a rotational basis, serving on or providing administrative support for Councils and Boards and assisting with review processes during peak times.

Staff work in partnership with other offices and divisions within the department including:

Superintendent of Public Instruction	Early Learning & Intervention
Deputy Superintendent/Chief of Staff	Title Programs
Government Affairs	Workforce and STEM Alliances
Communications	eLearning
Information Technology	School Support Services
Legal Affairs	Student Services
Finance	School & Community Nutrition
School Improvement	Licensing
Grants Management	Assessment
Accountability	

Staff also work closely with other state agencies that provide support for students with disabilities including:

Department of Health

Family and Social Services Administration including divisions listed below:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Department of Workforce Development

*First Steps

Indiana School for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ISBVI)

*Division of Disabilities and Rehabilitation Services

Indiana School for the Deaf (ISD)

*Vocational Rehabilitation Services

Department of Correction

*Office of Early Childhood and Out of School Learning

Office of the Attorney General

*Department of Child Services

Department of Administration

*Division of Family Resources

State Board of Education

*Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning

State Budget Agency

*Division of Mental Health and Addiction

State Board of Accounts

*Division of Contracts Management

Legislative Services Agency

*Division of Financial Management

GENERAL SUPERVISION COMPONENTS

For the purposes of this document Indiana is using a modified version of the U.S. Department of Education's guidance that OSEP offered in the Regional Implementation Meetings - Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004, "*Concepts of General Supervision*." Indiana has identified eight components of general supervision which will be discussed in detail later in this introduction:

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report;

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation;

Integrated Monitoring Activities;

Fiscal Management;

Data on Processes and Results

Improvement Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

Effective Dispute Resolution

Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development.

1) State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The current SPP is effective from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SPP describes each of the 17 federal indicators and provides a target for each. Each indicator is categorized as either 'compliance' (the target is 100% or 0%, depending upon the indicator) or 'results' (the target is set by IDOE/OSE based on trend analysis and stakeholder input). Some are measured by a statewide number, others include a compilation of local education agency (LEA) information, i.e. the percentage of LEAs that meet the target.

Submitted to OSEP each year, the APR reflects the performance of Indiana LEAs based upon data collected per indicator and includes the findings made, allowing a year for correction by LEAs that did not meet the targets set for specific indicators. See "Integrated Monitoring Activities," below for a description of data collection.

The SPP and APR are posted on the IDOE <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>.

2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The Indiana special education rules are promulgated in the Indiana Administrative Code at 511 IAC 7-32, 7-49. This rule is commonly known as "Article 7," and there is an agency version that includes a table of contents and an index for reader reference.

"Navigating the Course: Finding your way through Indiana's Special Education Rules" was written to provide an overview and a practical resource to help parents, advocates, school personnel, and students understand the requirements of Indiana's special education rules, Article 7.

When questions arise as LEAs and local programs implement Article 7, necessary clarification is provided by the Director of Special Education, and this guidance/clarification is included through the Question/Answer Section of the "From the Director" newsletter and is posted on the "Learning Connection," which is the IDOE online resource for education stakeholders. In addition to the various learning communities found on the Learning Connection Website, users can also find curriculum resources, academic standards, and post

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

questions and/or suggestions. The Learning Connection is available as a resource not just to Special Education Directors, but to parents, teachers, both general and special education, building principals, Superintendents and any other education stakeholder.

Article 7 and Navigating the Course are aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and are implemented by local programs, including LEAs and state-run programs. The documents are referenced by IDOE/OSE personnel when providing technical assistance in calls and emails from the general public and both serve as the basis of any technical assistance and training offered through IDOE/OSE.

3) Integrated Monitoring Activities

Annually, the IDOE/OSE makes a determination whether LEAs meet the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B, which is reflected in Article 7. The IDOE/OSE makes this determination based upon data collected throughout the year and compares it to the indicator targets in the SPP, information obtained through LEA monitoring activities, and any other publicly available information. IDOE/OSE categorizes each LEA as:

- 1) Meets Requirements and purposes of Part B of IDEA;
- 2) Needs Assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA;
- 3) Needs Intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA; or
- 4) Needs Substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act.

Depending upon the LEA determination, IDOE/OSE may offer technical assistance/training, require a corrective action plan to resolve the root cause issue(s), and/or put special conditions on funds of an LEA. LEA determinations are posted on the IDOE/OSE's public website.

IDOE/OSE conducts various monitoring activities that focus on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities, and ensuring that LEAs and other educational programs meet the program requirements under Part B of the IDEA. IDOE/OSE conducts monitoring activities through the collection and analysis of data that the LEAs submit throughout the year. These data are compared to the targets as defined in the SPP. As explained in the APR Introduction, Indiana has implemented Results Driven Accountability, using not only the SPP results and compliance indicators, but other results data as well as data timeliness.

There are seventeen specific SPP indicators, tied to three overarching themes, that are the cornerstones to Part B of IDEA:

- 1) Provision of a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;
- 2) The IDOE/OSE exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services; and
- 3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification of the student with a disability.

The IDOE/OSE Monitoring Team members are each responsible to monitor LEA compliance with/results for specific indicators found in the SPP. Depending upon how the information is reported in the APR, the team members analyze either LEA data or statewide data. With the implementation of RDA, it was decided by the RDA Stakeholder group that all LEAs for Indicators 11 and 12 would have data collected and analyzed annually. (In prior years data for each LEA was reviewed once every three years). Indicator 13 continues on a three year rotation. All LEAs are reviewed annually for the other compliance indicators (Indicators 4, 9, and 10).

In addition, all noncompliance identified through Indiana's effective dispute resolution process must be corrected as soon as possible and no later than one year after the noncompliance has been identified.

As the LEA information becomes available from IDOE data collections, the members of the team review the data for completeness and work with the individual LEAs as necessary to make sure the data was accurately submitted. In some cases, for example the disproportionality indicators, the data is sent to a vendor who is responsible for clean-up, analysis, and synthesis of the data. The data is then compared to the targets identified in the SPP. Some information submitted by an LEA for compliance indicators are determined to meet the targets based strictly on data, i.e., did the identification of a student's eligibility for special education occur within the state identified timelines. However, other compliance decisions take additional factors into account before determining if there is a finding of noncompliance. Depending upon the indicator, in addition to an analysis of the data, a team member may look at LEAs policies, procedures and practices as part of the noncompliance decision.

With the implementation of Results Driven Accountability, data is collected for the additional results data elements and whether data was submitted on a timely basis. The LEA data is then either placed into a quintile (results elements), compared to a compliance target (compliance indicators), or deemed 'on time' (timely data element). The LEA is awarded points dependent upon targets reached successfully.

The various data points that make up each of the three RDA elements are 'weighted' within the category, based on the stakeholder input. The RDA calculation is then run, resulting in an overall category score. The three overall category scores are weighted across the categories (50%, 30%, 20%) then added together, resulting in the RDA determination score.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

IDOE/OSE assigns a range of scores for each of the determination categories (Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, Needs Substantial Intervention). The LEA is assigned a determination category based on the RDA determination score. Differentiated support is then provided to the LEA based on the assigned category.

Letters are sent to LEAs detailing their scores on each of the 3 elements that make up Results Driven Accountability (Results, Compliance and Data timeliness) and the LEA determination category. This letter includes finding(s) of noncompliance in regard to the compliance indicators. If an LEA is out of compliance, it must, as necessary, determine the root cause of noncompliance and develop a corrective action plan to address the reason(s) for noncompliance. The designated IDOE/OSE education specialist provides assistance throughout the process and maintains regular contact with the LEA staff responsible for correction of the identified noncompliance. This regular contact is in the form of telephone calls, face to face visits as well as emails consisting of discussion about the issues, provision of technical assistance and identification of resources to assist with correction.

Using a two-pronged approach, education specialists are responsible to work with their assigned LEAs to verify that each incidence of noncompliance is corrected within the required timelines (Prong 1). For example, verification that Transition IEPs are developed during the appropriate timeframe and contain all required components. The education specialist is also responsible to review updated data to ensure that any systemic issues causing noncompliance are addressed (Prong 2). If it is discovered during these regular contacts that the LEA is not making sufficient progress in correcting noncompliance, more concentrated technical assistance is provided to ensure verification of correction during the required timeline. Once the correction has been verified the LEA is issued a letter documenting that the noncompliance has been corrected. If the LEA is unsuccessful in correcting noncompliance within the required timelines, the IDOE/OSE will impose the appropriate sanctions and/or enforcement.

Go to this webpage: <https://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>. Then see the 'Federal Reporting' section. The posted Excel workbook named "LEA Report on All Indicators" has information about each LEA for each compliance or results indicator and whether the target was achieved by the LEA.

4) Fiscal Management

IDOE/OSE is responsible for three fiscal management areas:

A) Distribution and monitoring of Federal Part B funds. The Part B grants consist of section 611 (students ages 3-21) and section 619 (students ages 3-5). The purpose of these funds is to pay the costs of providing special education and related services to students who are eligible for special education services. These funds are to supplement state, local and other federal funds. The IDOE/OSE team members provide intensive technical assistance to LEA personnel to ensure the funds are utilized and reported appropriately.

The funds are distributed through an application process which includes:

An LEA budget that is built upon allowable costs, e.g., personnel/benefits, equipment, purchased services, materials, etc.; Identification of a proportionate share of Part B funds that will be spent on equitable services for parentally-placed private school children with disabilities; Maintenance of Effort, which requires 1) an LEA budget at least the same amount of local or state and local funds on the education of students with disabilities as the LEA spent for the same purpose in the most recent fiscal year, and 2) an LEA expend at least the same amount of local-or state and local - funds on the education of students with disabilities either by the per capita or aggregate option in comparison to the most recent fiscal year the LEA met MOE using the same option; Identification of Excess Costs, ensuring that an LEA can demonstrate that IDEA funds are used only for the excess costs that are required to provide FAPE to children with disabilities; Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). CEIS can be a voluntary or mandated process by which an LEA may expend up to 15% of the LEAs total 611 and 619 Part B funds on students who have been identified as at risk for special education services. If an LEA has exceeded the Indiana defined bar for discipline, special education identification or least restrictive environment, the LEA is mandated to expend exactly 15% of its total 611 and 619 allocations on students who have not been identified as needing special education or related services but need academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment.

IDOE/OSE personnel not only distribute Part B funds in accordance with federal requirements, they assure the funds are used in accordance with federal and state requirements, by providing oversight on the use of funds.

IDOE/OSE personnel monitor for the appropriate use of the Part B funds. For example, the proportionate share of Part B funds must be documented by the LEA through submitted quarterly reports that include an itemization of expenditures and costs. IDOE/OSE provides assistance to LEAs regarding maintenance of effort, clarifying that expenses should be consistent year to year, logically be connected to special education, and that expenses be tracked for audit purposes.

The IDOE/OSE staff monitor that the CEIS funds are spent appropriately. The LEA must itemize expenditures and costs, report the number of students receiving services through CEIS funding and the number of students eligible for special education services after receiving services during a reporting period, and a description of the activities implemented through use of the funds that will be sustained. The members of the fiscal team work closely with the monitoring team in this process.

IDOE/OSE utilizes a portion of the Part B funds for administrative support, including contracts to entities for the provision of technical assistance and professional development to LEAs.

B) Medicaid reimbursements: IDOE/OSE staff provide policy support for all school-based Medicaid claiming as well as technical assistance to participating LEAs. For covered IEP-required services (e.g., physical therapy, nursing services, etc), the LEA is reimbursed at the Medicaid-allowable rate per service and recovers federal funds pursuant to applicable federal and state laws and rules. Subject to applicable federal policy, an LEA can also participate in Medicaid Administrative Claiming to recover the allowable portion of its state and locally funded costs to facilitate healthcare access for all its potentially eligible students. IDOE/OSE also provides contracted systems support, training, and claim calculation assistance to LEAs that participate in Medicaid Administrative Claiming.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

C) Excess Cost Funding: IDOE/OSE personnel manage a state line item fund that can be accessed by the LEA to cover the excess costs of educating students whose disabilities are of such intensity as to preclude achievement in the existing local public school setting.

The LEA may access this fund using an application that justifies the school's inability to meet the student's extraordinary educational need without this funding. The application is primarily based upon the services that are identified in the IEP of the student, including consideration of least restrictive environment and includes detailed information about any private vendor and the costs of the service(s). The funding may pay for services that include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) A public or private residential program when services in a residential setting are necessary for the student to benefit from special education.
- (b) Nonresidential services necessary to enable the student to remain in the community without resorting to residential placement or to return to the local community from a residential placement.

The IDOE/OSE personnel administer the funding process from receipt of application to payment for services via a state contract with either a private vendor or directly with the LEA. The state contract regulations involve IDOE Finance Division and several other state agencies.

5) Data on Processes and Results

School and LEA staff prepare and submit data regarding students, personnel, and other required data via the IDOE STN Application Center and DOE Online. Public schools, including charter schools, and accredited nonpublic schools submit required data. There are various required data submissions during the school year, some of which are specific to special education students:

- i. Child count
- ii. Personnel
- iii. Educational environments
- iv. Student exiting information
- v. Discipline
- vi. Assessment
- vii. Dispute resolution

The information is also used to complete the annual performance report required by OSEP, and as mentioned previously, as part of the Results Driven Accountability system.

Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each state submit data about children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA. This data includes:

Assessment

Child Count

Child Count and Educational Environments

Discipline

Dispute Resolution

Educational Environments

Exiting

Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services

Personnel

Data is used to inform all of the projects that IDOE/OSE is involved in. IDOE/OSE provides data to members of the general public, school personnel, State Board of Education, and legislators. Confidentiality laws are followed.

IDOE/OSE have scheduled "Data Retreats" for spring, 2019 based upon the three elements that make up the Results Driven Accountability system. LEAs will be asked to review the data following a model that is based upon the *Part B Tree Of Influence* that was developed by RRCP as a blueprint for state improvement. LEA staff will be asked to review data for long range outcomes, intermediate outcomes as the result of strategies and invested resources and have discussion of next steps.

6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

As stated earlier, IDOE/OSE personnel are to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(FAPE) so they can be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum. IDOE/OSE has the state authority to enforce regulations, policies and procedures to ensure LEA compliance. IDOE/OSE assists the LEA, through guidance, technical assistance and training, and in the correction of deficiencies that are identified. If the LEA deficiencies persist, IDOE/OSE has a range of activities that may be utilized to assist in the correction. In the event the LEA does not correct noncompliance within one year, the IDOE/OSE considers imposing sanctions ranging from more intensive technical assistance to placing special conditions on the use of Part B funds.

Additionally, in the dispute resolution process there are elements of improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions. Additionally, the dispute resolution process is explained more thoroughly below (see #7).

A. Complaint Investigation: The complaint is submitted to the IDOE/OSE and a complaint investigator investigates the allegations then develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, conclusions, and corrective action, if any.

B) Mediation: is a voluntary and confidential process that provides a trained and impartial mediator to facilitate discussion between the parent(s) and school to help the parties resolve a disagreement. If the disagreement is resolved through mediation, the parties must put their agreement in a written agreement.

C) Due Process Hearing: At the conclusion of the hearing, the Independent Hearing Officer considers all of the information and issues a written decision.

If, through the process of compliance monitoring an LEA has a finding of non-compliance, the LEA must complete, as necessary, a Root Cause Analysis to determine the reason(s) for non-compliance. From that, the LEA must develop a Corrective Action Plan. The plan must then be implemented, and the non-compliance fixed within a year of the finding. If the non-compliance is not fixed within a year, the LEA has 'uncorrected' non-compliance, and if not fixed after the second year, the LEA goes into 'long standing' non-compliance. Findings as well as any continued non-compliance impacts the Determination score.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires the OSE to determine if each local educational agency (LEA) meets the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. Based on an LEA's score on a number of criteria based upon compliance indicators, the LEA is ranked in one of four categories of determination.

LEA DETERMINATION	RESULT
Meets Requirements	No Action Needed by LEA
Needs Assistance	LEA works with OSE specialist; provided with resources
Needs Intervention	LEA works with OSE specialist; specific resource plan (TA/PD) developed that LEA must follow
Needs Substantial Intervention	Individually determined. In recent years Indiana has had one district with this determination, and they were placed on Special Conditions for their Part B grant.

IDOE has imposed Special Conditions on one Local Educational Agency (LEA) for the grant award under Part B to ensure that the LEA General Supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) corrects noncompliance as required.

These special conditions were imposed because:

1. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements to evaluate and determine students eligible within 50 instructional days;
2. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for transition services;
3. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for discipline procedures;
4. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for disproportionality in suspensions and/or expulsions;
5. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for disproportionality in identification of students with disabilities based on race/ethnicity;
6. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for Least Restrictive Environment;
7. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for Maintenance of Effort;
8. The failure of the LEA general supervision system to timely correct noncompliance; and
9. The failure of the LEA to provide an appropriately certified sign language interpreter.

It should be noted that the LEA, though still under special conditions, made great strides during the APR reporting year. The State took over academics and finances, resulting in a change in upper management as well as other management positions (including special education). This has resulted in a year of sweeping changes in written policy, procedures and practices.

7) Effective Dispute Resolution

The working relationship between the student with a disability, his or her family, and school personnel is generally positive as all parties work together to make decisions about the student's education. When there is a disagreement that cannot be worked out at the local level there are three conflict resolution options available:

A) A complaint, which can be filed by anyone, alleges that a school is not complying with: state/ federal special education or related

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

requirements; a signed mediation agreement; a signed resolution agreement; or, a hearing officer's orders.

A complaint may involve one student or a group of students. The complaint is submitted to the IDOE/OSE and a complaint investigator investigates the allegations then develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, conclusions, and corrective action, if any.

B) Mediation may be used on a voluntary basis to resolve any disagreements between a parent and the LEA, including those involved in complaints and due process hearings. All parties must agree to participate in mediation which is conducted by a trained mediator. The discussions are confidential, and the mediation agreement is legally binding.

C) Due process hearings involve an 'independent hearing officer'. The parent, 18 year old student, the school, or the IDOE may make a written request for a due process hearing. The process involves administrative proceedings similar to court, and the parties can be represented by counsel or non-attorney advocate. If the hearing was requested by the parent, the school is required to conduct a resolution session. The parties may agree to mediate in lieu of the resolution session. If the issue is not resolved or settled, a hearing will be conducted. The hearing officer makes a written decision, and there is an opportunity to appeal.

In addition to these three formal means of dispute resolution that are identified in Article 7, Indiana also offers facilitated IEP (FIEP) as a means to address concerns within the IEP team meeting, referred to, in Indiana, as the case conference committee (CCC). A trained facilitator is provided upon request and at no cost to the parties.

IDOE/OSE works with the LEAs, as well as the Parent Training and Information Center to ensure that parents receive and understand their rights and responsibilities.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

For purposes of this section 'technical assistance' is defined as the provision of advice and assistance in the implementation, installation and maintenance of the concepts related to improving the performance of students with disabilities. With the implementation of Results Driven Accountability the support will be matched to the LEA determination and subsequent assistance will be differentiated.

In Indiana, the provision of LEA technical assistance and professional development go hand in hand. Dependent upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development. For ease of reading, the levels of assistance will be outlined as the 'Technical Assistance System', and the provision of technical assistance/professional development will be addressed in the "Professional Development System" description portion of the introduction.

IDOE/OSE provides technical assistance and professional development based upon three levels of need:

- 1) Universal
- 2) Targeted
- 3) Intensive

The universal level is available to all LEAs and includes resources through: discussion with or training by the IDOE/OSE staff members; the IDOE website including topic specific communities of learning; the IDOE Learning Connection; information about state and national resources (including the OSEP funded national technical assistance centers as well as the Indiana Resource Network [contracted vendors]); links and contact information to relevant local, regional and state resources; written guidance about specific topics; short video clips called 'Short Shares' and 'Coffee Talks', webinars, and, question and answer documents.

The targeted level of assistance is available to those LEAs who have identified noncompliance found through the monitoring process described elsewhere in this introduction, or, if the LEA is in danger of being out of compliance if procedure/practice revisions are not made. The targeted level also includes those LEAs who have had personnel changes and require assistance to ensure new staff gain the knowledge of the expectations under IDEA. Assistance is provided via: webinars; conference calls; on-site or regional training opportunities that include evidence based practices; and, summits.

The intensive level of assistance has a focus on those LEAs that have identified issues that most likely are systemic and require rigorous LEA work and focused assistance by the IDOE/OSE and/or the Indiana Resource Network. Assistance will be individualized dependent upon the identified issue(s) and could include 1 to 1 consultation between LEA and IDOE/OSE and/or the Indiana Resource Network personnel (telephone, email, on site) and topic specific training provided to LEA staff by IDOE/OSE and/or contracted vendors.

As technical assistance and professional development occur in Indiana, the IDOE/OSE follows the principles of adult learning and

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

includes evidence based practices. The effectiveness of the implementation is measured through the data collected for the specific indicators or evidence that practice has changed.

With the implementation of Results Driven Accountability, there will be a direct correlation between the LEA determination level and the level of assistance provided (differentiated).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

For purposes of this introduction ‘professional development’ is defined as the provision of training and technical assistance activities leading to the acquisition of skills and knowledge to improve the performance of students with disabilities. Depending upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development.

IDOE/OSE provides assistance to LEAs either directly (telephone/email and on-site) or indirectly (online resources, and/or through vendors that have been contracted for the purpose of technical assistance and/or professional development (Indiana Resource Network) (<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indiana-resource-network>)).

These entities are described below and can be directly accessed by the LEAs in the state:

Indiana IEP Resource Center Focus: To increase knowledge, skills, and capacity of Indiana educators to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The IEPRC promotes inclusive education with a belief in shared responsibility and equitable access to a strong core curriculum with high quality instruction benefitting all students. The IEPRC provides professional learning and technical assistance statewide which includes developing resources and materials, training and coaching individuals and teams, facilitating statewide and regional collaborative networks, advancing the use of statewide technology during the IEP process, and delivering intensive services and support to districts as assigned by the IDOE.

Indiana Center on Teacher Quality (ICTQ) In partnership with schools, families, agencies and communities, the Indiana Center on Teacher Quality (ICTQ) seeks to improve educational outcomes for students by ensuring their access to a pre-k through 12 continuum of instruction from high quality teachers. ICTQ intends to 1) increase the number of high quality teachers serving students with disabilities by providing job embedded professional development at the state, regional and district levels; 2) increase the number of students with disabilities who have access to a high quality teacher by improving recruitment, support and retention of all teachers who teach students with disabilities across the LRE continuum (general education and special education); and 3) to improve school transitions and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities through partnerships and collaborations among schools, community agencies, higher education and families in a pre-K-12 system of support by aligning the policies and practices of key educational stakeholders across the lifespan serving individuals with disabilities.

Project Success Project SUCCESS supports higher academic achievement for students with disabilities. They build local capacity to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and leave high school ready for post-secondary options. Project SUCCESS strives to support teams of teachers and administrators as they work to implement academic standards into instruction for students with disabilities. Project SUCCESS provides current, research-based resources related to content standards, instructional design, complex communication needs, alternate diploma requirements and student outcomes specifically designed to meet the needs of students with significant disabilities.

Project SUCCESS provides support and technical assistance to teachers throughout the state through regional training, on-site visits, coaching, webinars, and by the dissemination of useful information via email and social media.

IN*SOURCE Focus: Since 1975, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs or IN*SOURCE has provided service to Indiana’s families of infants, toddlers, children, youth and young adults with disabilities. IN*SOURCE is a parent organization. Through the work and dedication of the Board of Directors, the staff and many volunteers, virtually all of whom are parents of persons with disabilities, IN*SOURCE, utilizing a proven parent to parent model, has provided assistance, support services and educational resources to the community of individuals and organizations that serve and support persons with disabilities. Through the provision of information, training, individual assistance and support, they worked to help countless families confront the complexities and challenges of having a loved one with special needs.

Pass Project: Promoting Achievement for Students with Sensory Loss Focus: To provide professional development opportunities for educators that will improve instructional quality, promote academic achievement and foster successful post-secondary transition outcomes for students with sensory loss.

PATINS Project Focus: The PATINS Project is a state-wide technical assistance network that provides accessible technology for assisting LEAs in the utilization and creation of accessible learning environments and instructional materials. The PATINS Project provides a complete state NIMAS delivery process, inclusive of assistive and accessible technologies, designed to support the Indiana

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Department of Education and LEAs in addressing the statutory and final regulatory requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM) Focus: The Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM) is a PATINS Project managed web-based system designed to provide supports to Indiana LEAs in meeting the NIMAS regulations of the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004. The mission is to partner with LEAs in securing accessible textbooks and core curriculum materials in specialized formats for qualifying students with print disabilities. Access to the system, technical support and professional training are provided through the ICAM and PATINS projects.

Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center Focus: To create and enhance professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity that will improve school and post-school outcomes. The center's work focuses on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and, family involvement.

The Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) Focus: To assist the Indiana Department of Education in defining and identifying disproportionality in special education, and provides technical assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in order to increase equity in special education throughout the state.

Virtuoso Education Consulting

Focus: To empower educators to meet the needs of all students by developing practitioners' awareness, knowledge, and skills related to best practices in the PK-12 environment. The team helps educators meet school improvement goals, remediate disproportionality, close discipline and achievement gaps, and develop proficiency in culturally responsive practices.

Indiana School Mental Health Initiative

Vision: To ensure all of Indiana's students, including those with disabilities, are socially, emotionally, and mentally healthy so they are ready to learn and can achieve their full potential.

Mission: To build local capacity by providing resources and training with the goal of supporting schools and their community partners as they work together to address the social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health needs of Indiana's students.

Goals: raise awareness on the effects of trauma, stress, and adversity on social, emotional, and cognitive development; promote the development of multi-tiered, cross-system infrastructures to support school communities in addressing the social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health needs of their students and staff within existing structures; share best and promising practices across Indiana by building a community of practice and harnessing our collective knowledge; identify barriers that exist and work to close gaps in systems; assist school districts in building strong community partnerships and connecting to their local System of Care; and identify funding mechanisms and cross-system collaboration opportunities to promote the above.

The Early Childhood Center (ECC) provides training, technical assistance, data analyses, and strategic planning to support schools in improving the quality and impact of their preschool programs. Its work has focused on program evaluation and professional development related to inclusive services, universal design, collaborative service approaches, transition, family engagement, and high quality early education practices for all children. ECC has worked with early education programs serving children with and without disabilities throughout Indiana. It also works closely with Indiana's First Steps system in providing evaluation and continuous quality improvement services. do you want to mention SSIP here?

There are other resources in the state that can be accessed by the LEA, however IDOE/OSE does not have a direct contract relationship. They include:

Indiana Deafblind Services Project Focus: The Indiana Deafblind Services Project is designed to improve the quality of educational services available to Indiana's infants, toddlers, children and youth who have a combined vision and hearing loss.

PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center

Focus: To develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive school-wide positive behavior support sites and increase educators' knowledge and understanding of how PBIS impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate and least restrictive environment placements

HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center

Focus: To help school personnel increase knowledge, skill and application of research-based educational and behavioral strategies rooted in Applied Behavior Analysis and related to working with students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and other neurodevelopmental disabilities. These interventions will foster collaboration, data-driven decision making, and alternatives for discipline that will lead to improved instruction and limited behavioral challenges in the classroom as well as other school and community settings. A wide range of resources, materials, trainings and consultations are available to assist consumers in learning about and practically applying best practice strategies across disciplines, roles and settings with students of all ages and functioning levels. Services and resources are available for a range of free, low cost and fee-for-service or contractual basis.

Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) Focus: The Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) provides tools, training and technical assistance as schools increase student achievement, build staff capacity and align resources. Their work focuses on professional development related to teacher evaluation systems, differentiated instruction, classroom management, co-teaching,

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

instructional consultation teams (ICT), cultural responsive practices, and PBIS. In addition, CELL conducts program evaluations for a variety of district, state and national programs.

Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Education (CDHHE)

Focus: To promote positive outcomes for all deaf and hard of hearing children through information, services, and education. The CDHHE provides direct services and facilitation of services to children birth through school exit. The Indiana State Department of Health has executive oversight of the CDHHE. The CDHHE (The Center) works directly with school districts, professionals, parents/guardians and with State agencies, including the Department of Education, the Indiana School for the Deaf, the Family and Social Services Administration, and the Indiana State Department of Health. Services provided for school-age children include transition support from Part C to special education services, comprehensive multidisciplinary assessments, hearing assessments and technical assistance to schools, Teacher of Record services, secondary transition support, and school program consultation and assessments.

The Indiana Resource Center for Autism

Focus: The Indiana Resource Center for Autism (IRCA) staff are actively engaged in work that leads to improved outcomes for individuals on the autism spectrum and related disorders, and their families by providing professionals, family members, and individuals with ASD with the knowledge and skills to support children and adults in typical early intervention, school, community, work, postsecondary and home settings.

The work of IRCA covers a wide range of activities focused on building local capacity via information development and dissemination, customized trainings, statewide conferences, individual consultations, coaching, and research.

IRCA provides access to a wealth of free and practical tools that can be easily replicated and used across a variety of settings. As Indiana’s state legislated autism center, IRCA is committed to responding with accurate and timely information that addresses the needs of individuals across the autism spectrum and across the lifespan.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The development and subsequent implementation of Results Driven Accountability (RDA) involved stakeholders from the beginning. A core group of stakeholders developed the framework, detailed in the executive summary above, from the reauthorized Every Student Succeeds Act/Dear Colleague guidance on FAPE. Once the framework was completed other stakeholders provided input and suggestions for changes. these included the State Advisory Council, the entities of the Indiana Resource Network, and large group of school personnel (Principals, general education and special education teachers, psychologist, speech and language, etc). This group identified the areas that should be part of the RDA calculation, and 'weighted' the various elements for importance. The group also assisted with the plan to roll out information on RDA across Indiana. The data retreats planned for spring of 2019 will involve school personnel who received the RDA based determinations and input on the process will be discussed.

In the course of the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) input was obtained from parent groups, LEAs, other state agencies, and institutions of higher education. As targets for specific indicators were revised through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) the Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE) obtained stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC). Additionally, there is a specific stakeholder group that has been developed to address and include stakeholder input and engagement with regard to Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan. The members of this stakeholder group are a diverse group of members from various internal and external departments, and organizations that are able to provide support to the development and implementation of the SSIP.

In preparation for the FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 SPP, the OSE prepared trend data information for each of the indicators and developed recommended targets based upon that data. The stakeholders reviewed the trend data, discussed the information and as the result of that discussion identified the targets for each of the indicators. The stakeholders represent various constituency groups, including individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities as well as teachers, state and local education officials, program administrators, representatives of various state agencies, representatives of higher education institutions that prepare special education and related service personnel, representatives of nonpublic schools, and representatives of vocational, community, or business organizations concerned with the provision of transitional services to children with disabilities.

Attachments	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

1) How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A)

See "Compass: School and Corporation Data" at <https://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/overview.aspx>. This has detailed data for the state as well as local education agencies. See also "Find School and Corporation Data Reports" at <https://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports>.

The OSE sent a hard copy letter to each Local Education Agency (LEA) Superintendent as well as an electronic copy to the local Special Education Directors. These letters include an attachment that reflects the performance of the LEA.

The letters are found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>, under "Findings of Noncompliance", then "Status of Compliance Notifications".

see <https://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring> for an Excel spreadsheet "Compliance/Results Indicator Data For All Corporations Compared to Targets SY2015-2016", under "Federal Reporting"

2) A description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

The State Performance Plan is found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>, under "Federal Reporting", then "Indiana Part B SPP.

See <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting> for federally reported 618 data.

Attachments	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, and OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2016 APR. Specifically, the State did not publicly report on Indicator 14. Additionally, the State did not provide the actual target data for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports did not contain, as specified in the OSEP Response, all of the required information. With its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2015. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			74.00%	87.10%	75.00%	56.71%	59.95%	59.95%	95.00%	64.00%	67.00%
Data		69.46%	52.60%	53.20%	58.95%	58.95%	69.72%	65.31%	71.72%	69.29%	73.41%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	70.00%	72.00%
Data	70.87%	72.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	74.00%	76.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	6,633	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	9,359	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.87%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6,633	9,359	72.03%	74.00%	70.87%

Reasons for Slippage

Indiana's graduation rate for students with disabilities has averaged 71.46% in the most recent five school years, which is within one percent of this year's data. The overall graduation rate has adhered to this level with modest increases and decreases, after several years of generally increasing numbers. In alignment with this pattern, Indiana had a commensurate decline in graduation rates among its students without disabilities for the 2016-2017 graduation year. Graduation rate improvement is the highest-prioritized indicator on Indiana's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) plan for improvement of educational outcomes of students with disabilities.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The Indiana State Board of Education adopts course and credit requirements for earning a high school diploma in accordance with Indiana and federal law. Students had the option of earning one of the following four diplomas:

- General;
- Core 40;
- Core 40 with Academic Honors (AHD); or
- Core 40 with Technical Honors (THD).

To earn an Indiana Diploma, students in the graduating classes must:

- Meet course and credit requirements; and
- Pass the Graduation Qualifying Exam (GQE)/qualify for a GQE waiver. O

NOTE: There is no difference in conditions a youth with an IEP must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			26.00%	25.00%	24.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.00%	20.00%	9.01%	8.51%
Data		30.54%	32.63%	30.01%	26.99%	15.93%	10.76%	10.76%	8.54%	8.51%	6.94%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	8.01%	7.51%
Data	7.60%	5.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	7.01%	6.51%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,515	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	908	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	41	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	491	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	17	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
491	6,972	5.90%	7.01%	7.04%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

All students who are no longer enrolled in a school, and for whom there is not proper mobility documentation demonstrating continuing education consistent with the state's compulsory education law or documentation of receipt of a diploma or certificate of completion as specified in the student's IEP (except for those students who died during the school year or aged-out of special education services under Indiana law), are recorded as a dropout. For purposes of Indicator 2, this includes all youth aged 14 to 22.

Per federal regulations, a student cannot be reported as a dropout for a school year that the student has completed. Therefore, students finishing a school year without a diploma or certificate are reported as dropouts at the beginning of the next school year if and when they do not return to school.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Reasons for Slippage

The factors leading to slippage are individualized to each of the 60 additional students with IEPs who dropped out. IDOE requires LEAs to report the reasons students drop out, so slippage could be due to disinterest in curriculum, interpersonal problems, working/need to earn money, armed services enlistment, no show at age 18, truancy, expelled - did not return to an educational setting after expulsion served. Chronic student absenteeism and truancy are areas the IDOE has a strong focus. Strategies, including attendance monitoring 'early warning systems'; improving student health; improving student mental health; increasing student engagement; mentoring students for academic success, and, family and community involvement, have been shared with LEAs across the state.

Indiana also saw a decrease in its graduation rate, which is consistent with this data.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		96.87%	96.20%	97.10%	96.80%	96.00%	97.00%	95.50%	96.10%	96.58%	96.73%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		96.87%	96.20%	97.40%	97.30%	96.00%	97.00%	95.60%	96.50%	96.94%	97.68%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	88.66%	95.39%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	88.95%	96.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	90,728	88,057	95.39%	95.00%	97.06%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	90,787	88,540	96.03%	95.00%	97.52%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Specific LEA/Building Level assessment results are located on the DOE website (<https://www.doe.in.gov/doe/doe-data>), "Compass: School and Corporation Data". Once on the DOE Compass page:

- 1) input the name of the corporation or school into the search box (for example, Indianapolis Public Schools)
- 2) When the IPS page appears, hover over 'Student Performance' then click on the assessment tool (for example, ISTEP+)
- 3) When this page appears, choose the year, the subject and the grade to be reviewed (for example, 2016-17, both English/language arts, all grades)
- 4) Click on the pie chart of 'Pass/Did not Pass'
- 5) A new page with bar graphs of specific populations will appear. Scroll down to 'Results by Special Education'
- 6) Hovering over the special education/general education; pass/did not pass bars will provide specific numbers and percentages.

The DOE has created a place on the Office of Special Education homepage for Public reporting
<https://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>

Indiana has added an excel workbook to this website, see "Federal Reporting", that includes the performance of each LEA against specific Indicator Targets. Information about this indicator is located on the 'Assessment Results (Grads 3-8, 10) worksheet.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			34.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	48.00%	54.00%
			Data		33.31%	33.60%	39.88%	54.02%	43.00%	50.00%	52.70%	52.80%	55.12%	32.33%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	57.00%	61.00%
			Data		42.13%	42.50%	48.50%	64.11%	51.00%	57.00%	62.10%	60.20%	63.37%	35.41%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	60.00%	62.00%
		Data	25.72%	27.58%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	65.00%	67.00%
		Data	25.69%	25.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	64.00%	66.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	69.00%	71.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	88,057	23,741	27.58%	64.00%	26.96%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	88,540	24,653	25.36%	69.00%	27.84%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Specific LEA/Building Level assessment results are located on the DOE website (<https://www.doe.in.gov/doe/doe-data>), "Compass: School and Corporation Data". Once on the DOE Compass page:

- 1) input the name of the corporation or school into the search box (for example, Indianapolis Public Schools)
- 2) When the IPS page appears, hover over 'Student Performance' then click on the assessment tool (for example, ISTEP+)
- 3) When this page appears, choose the year, the subject and the grade to be reviewed (for example, 2016-17, both English/language arts, all grades)
- 4) Click on the pie chart of 'Pass/Did not Pass'
- 5) A new page with bar graphs of specific populations will appear. Scroll down to 'Results by Special Education'
- 6) Hovering over the special education/general education; pass/did not pass bars will provide specific numbers and percentages.

The DOE has created a place on the Office of Special Education homepage for Public reporting

<https://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>

Indiana has added an excel workbook to this website, see "Federal Reporting", that includes the performance of each LEA against specific Indicator Targets. Information about this indicator is located on the 'Assessment Results (Grads 3-8, 10) worksheet.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			1.25%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%	1.50%	1.25%	1.00%	1.40%	1.30%
Data		3.00%	0.30%	0.59%	1.16%	1.16%	1.45%	2.53%	1.98%	1.94%	1.62%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	1.20%	0.43%
Data	0.53%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0.33%	0.23%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 363

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
3	11	0%	0.33%	27.27%

Reasons for Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target for the reporting year and had slippage. There are a variety of factors that led to this slippage:

-In FFY 2016 there were no LEAs that had significant discrepancy. In FFY 2017 there were 3.

-In FFY 2016 Indiana used 2 years of data and in FFY 2017 3 years was used.

-Indiana contracted with a new vendor to do the file reviews. Indiana worked with the new vendor to develop an updated rubric used in file reviews/practices: <https://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/specialed/file-review-rubric-indicator-4.pdf>. Along with a new vendor we also implemented a system which included better inter-rater reliability.

Due to the items mentioned above, slippage occurred.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) in conjunction with the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) have been providing technical assistance to school districts on how to address areas of noncompliance. In order to correct the slippage that has occurred, IDOE has placed those school districts who are out of compliance into a system of technical support. School districts are required to demonstrate appropriate systems or policy change in order to correct and prevent non-compliance.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Indiana Department of Education defines Indicator 4A "significant discrepancy of students with disabilities in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days" as an incidence rate that is two times higher than the State rate for three consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum "n" size of 15 students with a disability suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 students in the comparison group.

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. This review was consistent with the requirements under 34 CFR §300.170(b) relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance would be issued.

Indicator 4A

Compliant LEAs	8
Non-compliant LEAs	3
LEAs that did not meet n size	345
LEAs that did not have 3 years of data	18
LEAs with noncompliance (Special Conditions)	1
Total	375

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

The baseline year was changed to 2015 in the last APR submitted 2/1/18. OSEP commented "The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table." OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR". Per a telephone conversation with OSEP personnel, on September 24, 2018, Indiana has subsequently changed the baseline to FFY2016 because the denominator was changed.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each LEA that the State identifies as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, Indiana completed the following process:

LEAs were notified that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold of 2.0) for this indicator.

Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review which included the following information:

- Requiring that the case conference committee consider positive behavioral interventions and supports to address any of the student's behaviors that impede the student's learning or the learning of others
- Requiring teachers of record to ensure that a student's IEP, including any behavioral intervention plan, is being implemented as written
- Explaining that the school will count a short-term removal from the student's placement for any part of the student's day as a day of suspension when the removal is not pursuant to the student's IEP
- Requiring compliance with I.C. 20-33-8-7 when a student is removed from the student's placement for any part of the day when the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

removal is not pursuant to the student's IEP

- Describing who is responsible for determining if a change of placement has occurred when a student has been removed/suspended for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year
- Describing the factors to be taken into account when making that decision
- Describing when the case conference committee must meet to determine if the student's misconduct is a manifestation of the student's disability
- Describing what the case conference committee must consider in determining if the misconduct is a manifestation of the student's disability
- Describing when a functional behavioral assessment is required to be conducted
- Describing what information is to be included in a functional behavioral assessment and how it is to be conducted
- Requiring that a functional behavioral assessment be conducted prior to developing a behavioral intervention plan
- Describing what must be included in a behavioral intervention plan

Each LEA was required to participate in a file review (practices) (minimum of 5 files). Topics/areas reviewed:

- Parent notification of change of placement
- Appropriate services provided during the removal
- Case Conference Committee (CCC) meeting held within 10 instructional days of the decision to change the student's placement
- CCC reviewed relevant information in the student's file, including the student's IEP, any teacher observations, and information provided by the parent to determine if the conduct in question was 1) caused by, or had a direct and substantial relationship, to the student's disability; or 2) the direct result of the school's failure to implement the student's IEP
- School took steps to remedy the deficiencies
- New or existing functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention plan reviewed
- Student placement discussion
- Student received appropriate services during removal
- Review of documentation concerning removal to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IAES) due to 1) carrying a weapon or school or possesses a weapon, 2) knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs or sells or solicits the sale of a controlled substance, or 3) inflicted serious bodily injury upon another person; while at school, on school premises, or at a school function
- CCC determines the IAES and appropriate services needed to enable the student to 1) continue to participate in the GE curriculum, although in another setting; 2) progress toward meeting IEP goals; 3) receive, as appropriate, a FBA and behavioral intervention services and modifications designed to address the behavior violation so that it does not recur

If policies, procedures and/or practices (including the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards) were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance were issued.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Explanation of Alternate Data

Not applicable

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Please see introduction for more information on the LEA that is currently on Special Conditions for the Part B funds.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that it excluded a total of 363 LEAs from the calculation, and that 11 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and had three years worth of data. However, the State had a total of 387 LEAs in FFY 2016 and a total of 394 LEAs in FFY 2017. Using either the FFY 2016 or 2017 total number of LEAs and subtracting 363 does not yield 11 LEAs meeting the n size. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

OSEP notes that in its definition of "significant discrepancy," the State reported that it compares the rate of suspension or expulsion among LEAs in the State and that "Indiana has a required minimum 'n' size of 15 students with a disability suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group." OSEP had requested clarification regarding the use of the comparison group. The did not provide any additional information.

Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2017. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						1.50%	2.31%	2.00%	1.70%	2.50%	0.27%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0.53%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 366

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
5	5	8	0%	0%	62.50%

Reasons for Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target for the reporting year and had slippage. There are a variety of factors that led to this slippage:

-In FFY 2016 there were no LEAs that had significant discrepancy. In FFY 2017 there were 5.

-In FFY 2016 Indiana used 2 years of data and in FFY 2017 3 years was used.

-Indiana changed how it calculated Indicator 4B: The relative risk ratio was computed as a ratio of the risk index of a race-ethnicity of students with disabilities in the LEA to the risk index of all races-ethnicities of students with disabilities combined in the state for out of school suspension/expulsion totaling more than 10 days. (LEA rate compared to State rate for students with disabilities by race.) Previously the LEA rate of one race/ethnicity was compared to all other races/ethnicities in the LEA.

Note: Comparisons are made using a risk index. The risk index is the percentage of students with disabilities from a particular racial or ethnic group who are suspended/expelled (OSS) totaling more than ten days. The risk index for a particular racial or ethnic group is compared to the risk index for all races-ethnicities of students across the state.

-Indiana contracted with a new vendor to do the file reviews. Indiana worked with the new vendor to develop an updated rubric used in file reviews/practices: <https://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/specialed/file-review-rubric-indicator-4.pdf>. Along with a new vendor we also implemented a system which included better inter-rater reliability.

Due to the items mentioned above, slippage occurred.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) in conjunction with the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) have been providing technical assistance to school districts on how to address areas of noncompliance. In order to correct the slippage that has occurred, IDOE has placed those school districts who are out of compliance into a system of technical support. School districts are required to demonstrate appropriate systems or policy change in order to correct and prevent non-compliance.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Indiana's definition identifies Significant Discrepancy of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American, White, and Multiracial) as a risk ratio for a given

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

racial/ethnic group that is greater than 2.0 for three consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum "n" size of 15 students with a disability in any of the racial/ethnic groups suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 students with a disability in the comparison group.

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis (of the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days) reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. This review was consistent with the requirements under 34 CFR §300.170(b) relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) were reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance were issued.

Indicator 4B

Compliant LEAs	3
Non-compliant LEAs	5
LEAs that did not meet n size	348
LEAs that did not have 3 years of data	18
LEAs with noncompliance (Special Conditions, please see introduction)	1
Total	375

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

The baseline year was changed to 2015 in last APR submitted 2/1/18. OSEP commented "The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table." OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR". Per a telephone conversation with OSEP personnel, on September 24, 2018, Indiana has subsequently changed the baseline to FFY2016 because the denominator was changed.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For each LEA that the State identifies as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, Indiana completed the following process:

LEAs were notified that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold of 2.0) for this indicator.

Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review which included the following information:

- Requiring that the case conference committee consider positive behavioral interventions and supports to address any of the student's behaviors that impede the student's learning or the learning of others
- Requiring teachers of record to ensure that a student's IEP, including any behavioral intervention plan, is being implemented as written
- Explaining that the school will count a short-term removal from the student's placement for any part of the student's day as a day of suspension when the removal is not pursuant to the student's IEP
- Requiring compliance with I.C. 20-33-8-7 when a student is removed from the student's placement for any part of the day when the removal is not pursuant to the student's IEP
- Describing who is responsible for determining if a change of placement has occurred when a student has been removed/suspended for more than 10 cumulative days in a school year

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Describing the factors to be taken into account when making that decision
- Describing when the case conference committee must meet to determine if the student's misconduct is a manifestation of the student's disability
- Describing what the case conference committee must consider in determining if the misconduct is a manifestation of the student's disability
- Describing when a functional behavioral assessment is required to be conducted
- Describing what information is to be included in a functional behavioral assessment and how it is to be conducted
- Requiring that a functional behavioral assessment be conducted prior to developing a behavioral intervention plan
- Describing what must be included in a behavioral intervention plan

Each LEA was required to participate in a file review (practices) (minimum of 5 files). Topics/areas reviewed:

- Parent notification of change of placement
- Appropriate services provided during the removal
- Case Conferene Committee (CCC) meeting held within 10 instructional days of the decision to change the student's placement
- CCC reviewed relevant information in the student's file, including the student's IEP, any teacher observations, and information provided by the parent to determine if the conduct in question was 1) caused by, or had a direct and substantial relationship, to the student's disability; or 2) the direct result of the school's failure to implement the student's IEP
- School took steps to remedy the deficiencies
- New or existing functional behavior assessment and behavior intervention plan reviewed
- Student placement discussion
- Student received appropriate services during removal
- Review of documentation concerning removal to an Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IAES) due to 1) carrying a weapon or school or possesses a weapon, 2) knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs or sells or solicits the sale of a controlled substance, or 3) inflicted serious bodily injury upon another person; while at school, on school premises, or at a school function
- CCC determines the IAES and appropriate services needed to enable the student to 1) continue to participate in the GE curriculum, although in another setting; 2) progress toward meeting IEP goals; 3) receive, as appropriate, a FBA and behavioral intervention services and modifications designed to address the behavior violation so that it does not recur

If policies, procedures and/or practices (including the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards) were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance were issued.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Explanation of Alternate Data

Not Applicable

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please see introduction for more information on the LEA that is currently on Special Conditions for the Part B funds.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that it excluded a total of 366 LEAs from the calculation, and that 8 LEAs met the minimum "n" size and had three years worth of data. However, the State had a total of 387 LEAs in FFY 2016 and a total of 394 LEAs in FFY 2017. Using either the FFY 2016 or 2017 total number of LEAs and subtracting 366 does not yield 8 LEAs meeting the n size. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

OSEP notes that in its definition of "significant discrepancy," the State reported that it compares the rate of suspension or expulsion among LEAs in the State and that "Indiana has a required minimum 'n' size of 15 students with a disability suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group." OSEP had requested clarification regarding the use of the comparison group. The did not provide any additional information.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2017 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 individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2017. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2008	Target ≥			60.37%	60.38%	60.39%	60.40%	60.41%	60.42%	60.43%	67.00%	68.00%
		Data		59.54%	63.19%	62.81%	63.77%	64.89%	67.86%	69.28%	68.81%	70.01%	70.55%
B	2008	Target ≤			15.30%	15.29%	15.28%	15.27%	15.26%	15.25%	15.24%	12.00%	11.50%
		Data		14.33%	13.14%	13.06%	12.94%	12.51%	12.60%	12.03%	10.90%	10.65%	10.55%
C	2008	Target ≤			1.22%	1.21%	1.20%	1.19%	1.18%	1.17%	1.16%	2.16%	2.15%
		Data		1.99%	2.20%	2.50%	2.42%	2.46%	2.25%	2.26%	2.19%	2.08%	2.06%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	69.00%	70.00%
	Data	71.40%	72.62%
B	Target ≤	11.00%	10.50%
	Data	10.42%	9.84%
C	Target ≤	2.14%	2.13%
	Data	2.02%	1.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.00%	72.00%
Target B ≤	10.00%	9.50%
Target C ≤	2.12%	2.11%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	157,460	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	116,496	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14,703	null

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,263	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	599	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1,011	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	116,496	157,460	72.62%	71.00%	73.98%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14,703	157,460	9.84%	10.00%	9.34%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2,873	157,460	1.86%	2.12%	1.82%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									38.71%	39.50%	40.00%
		Data								38.70%	40.34%	40.69%	40.12%
B	2011	Target ≤									35.19%	33.10%	33.00%
		Data								35.20%	33.32%	33.13%	33.81%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	40.50%	41.00%
	Data	39.08%	38.12%
B	Target ≤	32.90%	32.80%
	Data	34.09%	33.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	41.50%	42.00%
Target B ≤	32.70%	32.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,644	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,454	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	5,653	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	411	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	6	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,454	18,644	38.12%	41.50%	39.98%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,070	18,644	33.71%	32.70%	32.56%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2010	Target ≥						52.50%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%	72.00%	73.00%
		Data					52.00%	66.10%	64.20%	78.30%	73.70%	72.27%	69.83%
A2	2010	Target ≥						41.00%	41.50%	42.00%	42.50%	22.00%	23.00%
		Data					40.70%	36.10%	20.40%	20.10%	25.80%	19.83%	18.21%
B1	2010	Target ≥						65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%	80.50%	81.00%
		Data					65.10%	65.00%	72.60%	77.70%	81.30%	78.10%	77.55%
B2	2010	Target ≥						48.00%	48.50%	49.00%	49.50%	15.00%	15.50%
		Data					47.80%	32.40%	15.40%	13.30%	16.00%	10.27%	9.83%
C1	2010	Target ≥						77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	83.00%	83.50%
		Data					76.70%	63.10%	74.50%	80.00%	83.20%	81.22%	80.28%
C2	2010	Target ≥						64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%	16.50%	17.00%
		Data					64.40%	31.50%	16.90%	13.90%	17.40%	11.45%	11.26%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	74.00%	75.00%
	Data	73.00%	72.00%
A2	Target ≥	24.00%	25.00%
	Data	20.09%	17.29%
B1	Target ≥	81.50%	82.00%
	Data	79.77%	80.09%
B2	Target ≥	16.00%	16.50%
	Data	10.69%	8.29%
C1	Target ≥	84.00%	84.50%
	Data	82.59%	82.66%
C2	Target ≥	17.50%	18.00%
	Data	12.18%	9.85%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	76.00%	77.00%
Target A2 ≥	26.00%	27.00%
Target B1 ≥	82.50%	83.00%
Target B2 ≥	17.00%	17.50%
Target C1 ≥	85.00%	85.50%
Target C2 ≥	18.50%	19.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3,067
--	-------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	67	2.18%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	697	22.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,721	56.11%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	469	15.29%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	113	3.68%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2190.00	2954.00	72.00%	76.00%	74.14%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	582.00	3067.00	17.29%	26.00%	18.98%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	10	0.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	531	17.31%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,214	72.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	259	8.44%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	53	1.73%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2473.00	3014.00	80.09%	82.50%	82.05%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	312.00	3067.00	8.29%	17.00%	10.17%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	0.46%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	458	14.93%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,246	73.23%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	291	9.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	58	1.89%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2537.00	3009.00	82.66%	85.00%	84.31%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	349.00	3067.00	9.85%	18.50%	11.38%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

The Indiana Department of Education utilizes the ISTAR-KR assessment tool which is a derivative of the Foundations to the Indiana Academic Standards and is aligned to the Indiana Standards for Kindergarten in the areas of mathematics, English/language arts and three functional areas, including: physical skills, personal care skills and social-emotional skills. Teachers/SLP's complete the online questionnaire at the entrance, annually, and exit of the program. The initial entrance and final exit scores are used to assess growth. Student outcome and KR Cut scores were developed per age range. Based on the student data, a score that is equal to or above the expected score would be considered evidence of achievement at a level that is "comparable to same age peers".

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Indiana Department of Education utilizes the ISTAR-KR assessment tool which is a derivative of the Foundations to the Indiana Academic Standards and is aligned to the Indiana Standards for Kindergarten in the areas of mathematics, English/language arts and three functional areas, including: physical skills, personal care skills and social-emotional skills. Teachers/SLP's complete the online ISTAR-KR questionnaire at the Student's entrance, annually, and exit of the program. The initial entrance and final exit scores are used to assess growth.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			88.20%	88.40%	88.60%	42.20%	42.40%	42.60%	42.80%	69.00%	70.00%
Data			93.60%	80.40%	90.10%	42.20%	69.60%	70.70%	71.10%	92.69%	88.59%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	71.00%	72.00%
Data	96.05%	97.11%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	73.00%	74.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
7,078	8,856	97.11%	73.00%	79.92%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	5.03%	176220.00
---	-------	-----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The questions designed on the Indiana Parent Survey are intended to be answerable across the range of school-aged and pre-school aged students. Parents are given the option to answer "not applicable" on questions that may not address particular areas of their child's program. Additionally, the findings of facilitation are generated by a multi-variate measure that incorporates multiple aspects on the child's educational program, regardless of setting.

Please also note that respondents were representative of the overall population according to the grade of the child, as discussed in the next section of this report.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? Yes

Submitted survey: [Indiana Parent Survey FFY2017](#)

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indiana has conducted analyses for representativeness in disability categories, grade level, and ethnicity, using questions posed on the survey and the data collected for the child count on Dec. 1, 2017.

As regards the distribution of primary disabilities, parents were asked to identify their child's primary disability on the survey. Tests of representativeness are strongly indicative that the response rate was representative of the overall population of students with disabilities. Deviations from expected values of survey response distribution by disability categories were well within tolerable differences for representativeness. Tests of significance suggest interdependence between the survey respondents and the population.

The frequency distribution by student disability category and the overall disability category distribution for students across the state are as follows:

Primary Disability	Respondents		Population	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Autism Spectrum Disorder	1,029	12.27%	16,316	9.26%
Blind/Low Vision	77	0.92%	969	0.55%
Cognitive Disability	547	6.52%	14,132	8.02%
Developmental Delay	512	6.11%	4,566	2.59%
Deaf-Blind	2	0.02%	30	0.02%
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	111	1.32%	2,449	1.39%
Emotional Disability	502	5.99%	12,890	7.31%
Multiple Disabilities	216	2.58%	2,157	1.22%
Other Health Impairment	1,047	12.49%	24,701	14.02%
Orthopedic Impairment	69	0.82%	1,561	0.89%
Specific Learning Disability	2,433	29.01%	54,841	31.12%
Speech or Language Impairment	1,809	21.57%	41,139	23.35%
Traumatic Brain Injury	32	0.38%	469	0.27%

Regarding ethnicity/race, parents respond to racial or ethnic categories on the parent survey. Statistical tests of representativeness suggest that the response rate for ethnicity was representative of the overall population of students with disabilities. Deviations from expected values of survey response distribution by disability categories were within tolerable differences for representativeness. Tests of significance suggest interdependence between the survey respondents and the population.

The frequency distributions for ethnicities of respondents and the underlying population of students with disabilities are as follows:

Race/Ethnicity	Respondents		Population	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
American Indian/Alaska Native	21	0.24%	415	0.24%
Asian	71	0.83%	1,894	1.07%
Black/African American	686	8.00%	23,447	13.31%
Hispanic/Latino	528	6.15%	17,744	10.07%
Multi-racial	446	5.20%	9,008	5.11%
White	6,828	79.58%	123,712	70.20%

Regarding age, parents were asked to indicate their child's grade level on the parent survey, which is also collected by the Indiana Department of Education on the child count. Tests of representativeness are strongly indicative that the response rate was representative of the overall population of students with disabilities. Deviations from expected values of survey response distribution by grade level are within reasonable assumptions of representativeness, though note that white students are slightly overrepresented and black or African American students slightly underrepresented. Tests of significance suggest interdependence between the survey respondents and the population.

Grade Level	Respondents		Population	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Pre-Kindergarten	932	10.71%	13,367	7.59%
Kindergarten	565	6.49%	10,013	5.68%
Grade 1	595	6.84%	10,918	6.20%
Grade 2	668	7.68%	12,359	7.01%
Grade 3	753	8.65%	13,268	7.53%
Grade 4	779	8.95%	14,270	8.10%
Grade 5	732	8.41%	13,957	7.92%
Grade 6	606	6.96%	13,622	7.73%
Grade 7	632	7.26%	13,210	7.50%
Grade 8	577	6.63%	13,331	7.56%
Grade 9	494	5.68%	12,494	7.09%
Grade 10	451	5.18%	12,029	6.83%
Grade 11	403	4.63%	11,544	6.55%
Grade 12	465	5.34%	10,920	6.20%
Adult	50	0.57%	918	0.52%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indiana Department of Education adjusted the methodology by which responses were collected and aggregated on this survey for the FFY2017 indicator. This was done in order that the information collected be more granular and thus more useful to LEAs when using response data. This change in large part accounts for the significant difference between the percentage reported for FFY2016 and FFY2017.

This statement is included for informational purposes only as the target score was achieved.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.41%	0%	0.30%	0.29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0.29%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 89

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
1	0	305	0.29%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Indiana defines disproportionate representation as disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Multiracial) in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Indiana defines disproportionate representation as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 in special education and related services for three consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum “n” size of 15 students with a disability in a given population as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group (rate of overall special education identification of a racial or ethnic group of students comparing to all other racial or ethnic groups).

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator. Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review. Additionally, a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) were reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

Indicator 9

Compliant LEAs	305
Non-compliant LEAs	0
LEAs that did not meet n size	57
LEAs that did not have 3 years of data	32
LEAs with continued noncompliance	0
Total	394

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator. Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review. Additionally, a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) were reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued. Zero findings of noncompliance were issued.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

The baseline year was changed to 2015 in last APR submitted 2/1/18. OSEP commented "The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table."

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Per a telephone conversation with OSEP personnel, on September 24, 2018, Indiana has subsequently changed the baseline to FFY2016 because the denominator was changed.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	0	1	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

One LEA had a finding of noncompliance and was verified as corrected.

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding of noncompliance. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding of noncompliance. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.41%	4.15%	3.85%	4.05%	0%	3.18%	3.18%	1.13%	1.94%	2.70%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	1.84%	2.78%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 72

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
20	10	322	2.78%	0%	3.11%

Reasons for Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target for the reporting year and had slippage. There are a variety of factors that led to this slippage:

-In FFY 2016 Indiana used 2 years of data and in FFY 2017 3 years was used.

-Indiana contracted with a new vendor to do the file reviews. Indiana worked with the new vendor to develop an updated rubric used in file reviews/practices: <https://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/specialed/file-review-rubric-indicator-10.pdf>. Along with a new vendor we also implemented a system which included better inter-rater reliability.

Due to the items mentioned above, slippage occurred.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) in conjunction with the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) have been providing technical assistance to school districts on how to address areas of noncompliance. In order to correct the slippage that has occurred, IDOE has placed those school districts who are out of compliance into a system of technical support. School districts are required to demonstrate appropriate systems or policy change in order to correct and prevent non-compliance.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification

LEAs were notified that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold of 2.0) for this indicator. The relative risk ratio was computed as a ratio of the risk index of a race/ethnicity in the LEA to the risk index of all other races/ethnicities in the LEA for each specific disability category. (LEA rate of one race and eligibility category compared to LEA rate for all other races of same eligibility category.)

Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review which included the following information:

Detailing how LEA responds to requests for educational evaluations, including how a parent or agency may request the initial evaluation and the procedures for reevaluations

Describing how a multidisciplinary team will be assigned to conduct educational evaluations

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are provided in the student's native language or other mode of communication

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are provided in a form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are administered by trained personnel and in accordance with the evaluation/assessment protocol

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials include those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those designed to provide a single general IQ

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are selected and administered to ensure that the assessment accurately reflects the student's achievement rather than reflect the student's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless the instrument is designed to assess those areas)

Ensuring that the student is assessed (or that information is collected) in all areas related to the suspected disability

Ensuring that assessment tools and strategies provide relevant information that directly assists the case conference committee in determining the student's eligibility for special education

Requiring the multidisciplinary team to use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather required and relevant information about the student

Ensuring that the multidisciplinary team includes the requisite qualified professionals

Requiring the multidisciplinary team to review existing evaluation data on the student, obtain input from the student's parent, identify the suspected disability, and determine additional data needed to determine the student's eligibility for special education services

Ensuring that the evaluation report for a student with the suspected disability of Autism Spectrum Disorder includes assessment results and other information collected as aligned to the characteristics of Autism Spectrum Disorder

Ensuring the evaluation report for a student with the suspected disability of Specific Learning Disability includes the elements described in Indiana Code

Ensuring that the Case Conference Committee (CCC) does not determine that a student is eligible for special education if the determinant factor is the lack of instruction in reading or math or the student's limited English proficiency

Ensuring that the CCC does not determine that a student is eligible for special education if the student does not meet the eligibility criteria for the disability

Ensuring that the CCC does not determine the student eligible for special education when the student's only need is a related service

Ensuring that the case conference committee includes the requisite members

Ensuring that at least one of the qualified professionals from the multidisciplinary team attends the initial case conference committee meeting

Each LEA was required to participate in a file review (practices) (minimum of 5 files). Topics/areas reviewed:

1. General Initial Evaluation Requirements

1.1 Written notice of evaluation.

1.2 Signed parental consent for evaluation.

1.3 Written notice prior to the initial CCC containing:

(1) A description and overall findings of each:

(A) evaluation;

(B) procedure;

(C) assessment;

(D) record; or

(E) report;

that the school used as a basis for any proposed action.

(2) A description of action that the school may propose.

(3) An explanation of why the school may propose an action?

1.4 Educational evaluation conducted by a multidisciplinary team that includes but is not limited to: (1) At least one teacher licensed in or other specialist with knowledge in, the area of suspected disability; (2) A school psychologist except for suspected disabilities of DD, LI, SI; (3) For suspected SLD, the student's general education teacher; (4) For BLV, DHH, MD, representatives of the state-operated schools.

1.5 Findings of the evaluation compiled into an educational evaluation report and provided to the parent prior to or at the CCC.

1.6 Educational evaluation report contains information collected or considered for all areas addressed during the evaluation.

1.7 Notice of case conference committee meeting.

1.8 Notice of ineligibility or proposed IEP.

2. Disability-Specific Evaluation Requirements

Evaluation included the necessary components given the suspected area(s) of disability. Consider the requirements for the relevant suspected disability(ies). (information on specific eligibility requirements in rubric available upon request)

3. Eligibility Determination

3.1 Parent participation as a member of the case conference committee.

3.2 Required members of the CCC were present including at least one of the qualified professionals from the evaluation team.

3.3 The CCC considered all information contained in the educational evaluation report when determining eligibility.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

3.4 The CCC did not rely on any single measure of assessment as the sole criterion for determining eligibility or services.

3.5 CCC must not determine that a student is eligible if the determinant factor is lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math.

3.6 CCC must not determine that a student is eligible if the determinant factor is limited English proficiency.

3.7 Evaluation results support the eligibility decision made by the CCC.

If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance were issued.

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Indiana's definition of disproportionate representation is the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Multiracial) in specific disability categories (Cognitive Disability, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disability, Language or Speech Impairment, Other Health Impairment, and Autism Spectrum Disorder) that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indiana has a required minimum "n" size of 15 students with a disability in a given population as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group. Indiana calculates risk ratios for all of LEAs in the state. School districts must exceed the data threshold (2.0 risk ratio) for 3 consecutive years.

Indicator 10

Compliant LEAs	305
Non compliant LEAs	10
LEAs that did not meet n size	40
LEAs that did not have 3 years of data	32
LEAs with continued noncompliance	6
LEA with noncompliance (Special Conditions)	1
Total	394

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

LEAs were notified that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold of 2.0) for this indicator. The relative risk ratio was computed as a ratio of the risk index of a race/ethnicity in the LEA to the risk index of all other races/ethnicities in the LEA for each specific disability category. (LEA rate of one race and eligibility category compared to LEA rate for all other races of same eligibility category.)

Each LEA was required to participate in a policy and procedure review which included the following information:

Detailing how LEA responds to requests for educational evaluations, including how a parent or agency may request the initial evaluation and the procedures for reevaluations

Describing how a multidisciplinary team will be assigned to conduct educational evaluations

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are provided in the student's native language or other mode of communication

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are provided in a form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are administered by trained personnel and in accordance with the evaluation/assessment protocol

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials include those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those designed to provide a single general IQ

Ensuring that assessments and evaluation materials are selected and administered to ensure that the assessment accurately reflects the student's achievement rather than reflect the student's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless the instrument is designed to assess those areas)

Ensuring that the student is assessed (or that information is collected) in all areas related to the suspected disability

Ensuring that assessment tools and strategies provide relevant information that directly assists the case conference committee in determining the student's eligibility for special education

Requiring the multidisciplinary team to use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather required and relevant information about the student

Ensuring that the multidisciplinary team includes the requisite qualified professionals

Requiring the multidisciplinary team to review existing evaluation data on the student, obtain input from the student's parent, identify the suspected disability, and determine additional data needed to determine the student's eligibility for special education services

Ensuring that the evaluation report for a student with the suspected disability of Autism Spectrum Disorder includes assessment results and other information collected as aligned to the characteristics of Autism Spectrum Disorder

Ensuring the evaluation report for a student with the suspected disability of Specific Learning Disability includes the elements described in Indiana Code

Ensuring that the Case Conference Committee (CCC) does not determine that a student is eligible for special education if the determinant factor is the lack of instruction in reading or math or the student's limited English proficiency

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Ensuring that the CCC does not determine that a student is eligible for special education if the student does not meet the eligibility criteria for the disability

Ensuring that the CCC does not determine the student eligible for special education when the student's only need is a related service

Ensuring that the case conference committee includes the requisite members

Ensuring that at least one of the qualified professionals from the multidisciplinary team attends the initial case conference committee meeting

Each LEA was required to participate in a file review (practices) (minimum of 5 files). Topics/areas reviewed:

1. General Initial Evaluation Requirements

1.1 Written notice of evaluation.

1.2 Signed parental consent for evaluation.

1.3 Written notice prior to the initial CCC containing:

(1) A description and overall findings of each:

(A) evaluation;

(B) procedure;

(C) assessment;

(D) record; or

(E) report;

that the school used as a basis for any proposed action.

(2) A description of action that the school may propose.

(3) An explanation of why the school may propose an action?

1.4 Educational evaluation conducted by a multidisciplinary team that includes but is not limited to: (1) At least one teacher licensed in or other specialist with knowledge in, the area of suspected disability; (2) A school psychologist except for suspected disabilities of DD, LI, SI; (3) For suspected SLD, the student's general education teacher; (4) For BLV, DHH, MD, representatives of the state-operated schools.

1.5 Findings of the evaluation compiled into an educational evaluation report and provided to the parent prior to or at the CCC.

1.6 Educational evaluation report contains information collected or considered for all areas addressed during the evaluation.

1.7 Notice of case conference committee meeting.

1.8 Notice of ineligibility or proposed IEP.

2. Disability-Specific Evaluation Requirements

Evaluation included the necessary components given the suspected area(s) of disability. Consider the requirements for the relevant suspected disability(ies). (information on specific eligibility requirements in rubric available upon request)

3. Eligibility Determination

3.1 Parent participation as a member of the case conference committee.

3.2 Required members of the CCC were present including at least one of the qualified professionals from the evaluation team.

3.3 The CCC considered all information contained in the educational evaluation report when determining eligibility.

3.4 The CCC did not rely on any single measure of assessment as the sole criterion for determining eligibility or services.

3.5 CCC must not determine that a student is eligible if the determinant factor is lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math.

3.6 CCC must not determine that a student is eligible if the determinant factor is limited English proficiency.

3.7 Evaluation results support the eligibility decision made by the CCC.

If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings of noncompliance were issued.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

The baseline year was changed to 2015 in last APR submitted 2/1/18. OSEP commented "The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2015 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

as required by the Measurement Table."

OSEP cannot accept the FFY 2015 revised baseline. The State must revise baseline for this indicator for FFY 2017 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR". Per a telephone conversation with OSEP personnel, on September 24, 2018, Indiana has subsequently changed the baseline to FFY2016 because the denominator was changed.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	3	0	6

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Three of the LEAs that had findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected.

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Addressing Prong 1 of the requirements in the OSEP Memo 09-02 included verification of the LEA correction (when possible to correct) of student level noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a RCA questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. Included was the review of evidence of student-level correction and a review of policies, procedures, and practices, resulting in revisions as appropriate. Technical assistance and training were provided virtually and/or on-site by the Indiana Disproportionality Resource Center (IDRC) and/or Virtuoso Education Consulting for LEA administration, teachers and other special education staff. If a student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, individual correction was not made.

Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and an IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until all findings of noncompliance were corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

FFY 2016 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Six LEAs did not correct within a year. The IDOE specialist and/or the IDRC/Virtuoso consultant provided virtual and/or on-site technical assistance as mentioned previously but at greater frequency. Additionally, system wide improvement strategies were shared and encouraged with LEAs.

Explanation of Alternate Data

Not applicable.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Please see introduction for more information on the LEA that is currently on Special Conditions for the Part B funds.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the 20 districts identified in FFY 2017 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, 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 individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining districts identified in FFY 2013 and FFY 2016 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 2016, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.00%	85.90%	87.70%	92.30%	98.00%	98.50%	97.90%	97.85%	98.84%	99.26%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.71%	98.46%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
28,768	28,401	98.46%	100%	98.72%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	367
---	-----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The total number of students that were evaluated outside of the timelines for Indiana is 367 students. Timelines were missed for a variety of reasons identified as follows: staff shortages, the volume of referrals, scheduling conflicts, timeline errors, inadequate tracking, improper documentation, LEA data system errors and LEA staff errors.
In preparation for collecting data and doing determinations for FFY 2017, Indiana has transitioned to a Results Driven Accountability system that focuses on not only compliance but on student outcomes and results data. Through multiple stakeholder meetings we gathered feedback that lead us to including Indicator 11 data for every LEA in our state each year. We have this data available and our state stakeholders believed that this piece of data would allow us to get a more comprehensive look at each LEAs special education system. This is the reason that the numbers for Indicator 11 are much higher than last year. In prior years we have looked at one-third of our state each year.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data for this indicator was submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) via a secure site known as the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. Each Local Educational Agency (LEA) must upload child count as well as performance and compliance data to the STN Application Center. This data is then stored in the IDOE data warehouse where it can be extracted and used for state and federal funding, performance indicators, and compliance indicators. Target data was gathered from the IDOE-EV report and

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

then verified with LEAs to ensure accuracy. Data used in the APR is derived from the final verification reports submitted by LEAs.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
28	26	2	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the process of conducting the initial evaluation within timeline parameters. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review and a tab for to create a Corrective Action Plan to be completed by the staff of the LEA.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance.

To verify correction, IDOE staff **reviewed three (3) months (March 30 through June 30) of data for the following year. Those months were pulled and reviewed for each LEA to ensure 100% compliance was achieved. This data was accessed through the DOE data collection systems via the DOE-EV report (Evaluation report).**

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. (Prong 1 in OSEP Memo 09-02)

Specifically, the LEAs worked with OSE staff and identified those individual cases of noncompliance that were due to factors other than a student receiving services within the 50 day timeline. For example, the specific reason(s) of noncompliance included improper documentation, staff errors, inadequate tracking, scheduling conflicts, staff shortage, and school calendar errors. The OSE staff then verified each of the Prong 1 files were corrected by a review of each student STN (the student unique identifier) associated with the noncompliance.

The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The LEAs that were issued findings were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, all outstanding noncompliant initial evaluations were completed, although late. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system and verified the LEA achieved the 100% percent compliance requirement.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

LEAs identified as not meeting the required timeline for completing timeline compliance were required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in coordination with an education specialist at the IDOE during FFY2014. For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2013 (SY 13-14) or earlier, the previously developed CAP was evaluated for effectiveness and updated to reflect more comprehensive activities. The LEAs that were not able to verify correction of policies and procedures receive intensified consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and will participate in the required corrective action as identified above. Additional monitoring and data submissions are required as a part of the Corrective Action Plan.

The Education Specialist is working closely with the Special Education Director to look at the most recent data and the reasons for noncompliance. The specialist will continue working with the Director to address the issues that are continuing to impact compliance on timelines of eligibility. This includes visits to the districts to work with the evaluation teams regarding expectations and the provision of technical assistance to address questions the team has. After this onsite visit, both LEA's were able to put into place adjusted policies and procedures around initial evaluations. This resulted in significant improvements for both LEA's. One of the larger LEA's improved percentages from 91%-99% only having 5 STN's that missed the timeline. The other LEA, a small charter, improved their percentage from 54%-83%. A specialist is continuing to work with both LEA's to refine practices and look at data more frequently.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2014, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the State verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

--

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.80%	93.40%	91.70%	92.74%	97.80%	93.96%	98.93%	99.04%	98.56%	99.25%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	99.43%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,585
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	498
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,392
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	454
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	177
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	2,392	2,456	99.43%	100%	97.39%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	64
--	----

Reasons for Slippage

We would expect to have a small discrepancy as we have gone from using a sample size (1/3 of the state) to monitoring the entire population of the state. We have not seen a significant trend in changes to LEA practices for ensuring services are taking place by the 3rd birthday, but we do feel this is an area that could benefit from future guidance to increase our compliance rate.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

The data reflects there were 64 eligible children referred from Part C who did not receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) by the age of three in Indiana. Upon investigating the reasons for the noncompliance, it was determined that, in many cases, the Case Conference was held prior to the third birthday and these students were to receive services by the third birthday, but parents have requested children to begin on another day. Some examples of this were: following the weekend, after their birthday, and on a different day, in one case, due to the preschool having a calendar set up where there is no school on Mondays. LEAs have been contacted and have had conversations with the Indiana Department of Education where guidance was provided in the area of transition practices. LEAs have developed policies for ensuring this information is understood by their educators through updated manuals, professional development, and updated school calendars. Other reasons for noncompliance were data reporting errors. There were consistent errors in coding students which were reported noncompliant, but following further review would have been compliant with the correct coding. Our next steps include developing updated guidance to increase understanding of the allowable codes.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

In FFY 2017 the data for this indicator was submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) via a secure site known as the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. Each Local Educational Agency (LEA) must upload Child count as well as performance and compliance data to the STN Application Center. This data is then stored in the IDOE data warehouse where it can be extracted and used for state and federal funding, performance indicators, and compliance indicators.

Indicator 12 data was collected through the DOE-EV (Evaluation) report on July 1, 2018, and ranged from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018 in order to encompass the entire reporting year.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	0	2	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the process of conducting the initial evaluation within timeline parameters. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review and a tab for to create a Corrective Action Plan to be completed by the staff of the LEA.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance worked with IDOE staff and/or appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance.

To verify correction, IDOE staff reviewed three (3) months (March 30 through June 30) of data for the following year. Those months were pulled and reviewed for each LEA to ensure 100% compliance was achieved. This data was accessed through the DOE data collection systems via the DOE-EV report (Evaluation report).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. (Prong 1 in OSEP Memo 09-02)

Specifically, the LEAs worked with OSE staff and identified those individual cases of noncompliance that were due to factors other than a student receiving services by the third birthday. For example, the specific reason(s) of noncompliance included improper documentation, staff errors, inadequate tracking, scheduling conflicts, staff shortage, and school calendar errors. The OSE staff then verified each of the Prong 1 files were corrected by a review of each student STN (the student unique identifier) associated with the noncompliance.

The LEAs that were issued findings were assigned an IDOE consultant and were required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, all outstanding noncompliant initial evaluations were completed, although late. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system and verified the LEA achieved the 100% percent compliance requirement.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						80.22%	84.05%	73.32%	79.00%	81.05%	80.16%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	86.36%	85.47%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
435	505	85.47%	100%	86.14%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

For Indicator 13, the Indiana state law known as Article 7 requires transition plans begin at age 14, prior to the 9th grade, or earlier if determined appropriate by the case conference committee. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Office of Special Education contracted with the Center on Community Living and Careers (CCLC) at Indiana University to conduct a compliance review of a randomly selected sample of students' transition IEPs. The review was conducted to ensure that IDOE meets the reporting requirements and is providing ongoing assistance for school corporations with compliance rates less than 100%.

To determine and ensure compliance to Indicator 13, the IDOE has developed the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist based on a data collection tool created by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) and approved by the Office of Special Education Programs of the US Department of Education (OSEP). The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center at the CCLC, Indiana Institute on Disability and Community at Indiana University has created an on-line version of Indiana's data collection tool that was used to analyze Indiana's student records to determine compliance with Indicator 13. The ten-item Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist was utilized to assess if there was evidence in a student's IEP that the student had been provided the appropriate transition services to prepare him/her to successfully transition from secondary school to a post-secondary education and/or training program and to employment at an accuracy rate of 100%.

IDOE provided CCLC with a population database of students who were receiving special education services and met the Indiana transition IEP age criteria for the monitored school year and whose local school districts are part of the monitoring cycle. The database included the Student Test Number (STN), which is the State of Indiana's student identification number and the Corporation Code Number. To generate the sample, CCLC used Microsoft Excel software to run a random sampling program. If the corporation had less than 100 students with disabilities, three students were selected for the review. For corporations with more than 500 students, 10 students were selected. Therefore, a minimum of 3 and maximum of 10 Transition IEPs were reviewed based on size of the district. In some cases, charter schools had sample sizes of less than three students because these schools were serving limited number of

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

students or did not have large populations of students with disabilities. A report of the review is then provided to IDOE.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? Yes No

At what age are youth included in the data for this indicator? 14

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
44	44	null	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issued 44 Indicator 13 findings. These new findings were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition IEP checklist and 44 of those LEAs demonstrated correction within a year by achieving 100% compliance on current IEPs using the Indiana IIEP Requirements Checklist. The IDOE verified the correction of all non-compliance in those 44 LEAs. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures, and practices (prong 2) and confirming correction of each individual non-compliant transition IEP that had been identified previously (prong 1). The IDOE collected and verified the data by obtaining a new, randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklist to ensure that the individual and systemic non-compliance had been resolved. The IDOE maintained monthly communication via e-mails and phone calls, providing resources and technical assistance to the LEA until non-compliance was corrected. Depending upon the corrective action plan generated by the LEA, IDOE provided one-on-one training and technical assistance on site at the LEA or through regional trainings. Both LEA administrative and teaching personnel attended those opportunities.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The IDOE verified correction to all individual cases of non-compliance by using the Indiana Transition Requirements checklist to insure that each individual case had been corrected based on the IEP review in the Indiana IEP system. The IDOE also verified the enrollment status of a student of a non-compliant IEP if an LEA advised that the student was no longer enrolled due to graduation, transfer, withdrawal, etc. Correction was not required if the student was no longer enrolled.

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

These findings were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition IEP checklist those LEAs demonstrating correction within three years by achieving 100% compliance on current IEPs using the Indiana IIEP Requirements Checklist. The IDOE verified the correction of all non-compliance in these LEAs. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures, and practices (prong 2) and confirming correction of each individual non-compliant transition IEP that had been identified previously (prong 1). The IDOE collected and verified the data by obtaining a new, randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklist to ensure that the individual and systemic non-compliance had been resolved. The IDOE maintained monthly communication via e-mails and phone calls, providing resources and technical assistance to the LEA until non-compliance was corrected. Depending upon the corrective action plan generated by the LEA, IDOE provided one-on-one training and technical assistance on site at the LEA or through regional trainings. Both LEA administrative and teaching personnel attended those opportunities in the first year of non-compliance. In the subsequent year of non-compliance, IDOE continued to provide one-on-one training and technical assistance along with site visits.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The IDOE verified correction to all individual cases of non-compliance by using the Indiana Transition Requirements checklist to insure that each individual case had been corrected based on the IEP review in the Indiana IEP system. The IDOE also verified the enrollment status of a student of a non-compliant IEP if an LEA advised that the student was no longer enrolled due to graduation, transfer, withdrawal, etc. Correction was not required if the student was no longer enrolled.

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

These findings were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition IEP checklist those LEAs demonstrating correction within three years by achieving 100% compliance on current IEPs using the Indiana IIEP Requirements Checklist. The IDOE verified the correction of all non-compliance in these LEAs. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures, and practices (prong 2) and confirming correction of each individual non-compliant transition IEP that had been identified previously (prong 1). The IDOE collected and verified the data by obtaining a new, randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklist to ensure that the individual and systemic non-compliance had been resolved. The IDOE maintained monthly communication via e-mails and phone calls, providing resources and technical assistance to the LEA until non-compliance was corrected. Depending upon the corrective action plan generated by the LEA, IDOE provided one-on-one training and technical assistance on site at the LEA or through regional trainings. Both LEA administrative and teaching personnel attended those opportunities in the first year of non-compliance. In the subsequent year of non-compliance, IDOE continued to provide one-on-one training and technical assistance along with site visits.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The IDOE verified correction to all individual cases of non-compliance by using the Indiana Transition Requirements checklist to insure that each individual case had been corrected based on the IEP review in the Indiana IEP system. The IDOE also verified the enrollment status of a student of a non-compliant IEP if an LEA advised that the student was no longer enrolled due to graduation, transfer, withdrawal, etc. Correction was not required if the student was no longer enrolled.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							34.80%	35.30%	35.80%	36.30%	36.80%
		Data						34.30%	32.50%	33.90%	35.90%	33.21%	35.68%
B	2009	Target ≥							49.10%	49.60%	51.10%	63.50%	64.00%
		Data						49.10%	56.40%	62.10%	63.80%	60.26%	62.81%
C	2009	Target ≥							86.60%	87.10%	87.60%	77.50%	78.00%
		Data						86.10%	76.10%	77.90%	78.00%	79.49%	83.92%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	37.30%	37.80%
	Data	30.00%	31.15%
B	Target ≥	64.50%	65.00%
	Data	65.71%	70.49%
C	Target ≥	78.50%	79.00%
	Data	87.14%	86.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	38.30%	38.80%
Target B ≥	65.50%	66.00%
Target C ≥	79.50%	86.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	127.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	46.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	35.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	22.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	9.00

	Number of	Number of	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2017
--	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	respondent youth	respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	Data	Target	Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	46.00	127.00	31.15%	38.30%	36.22%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	81.00	127.00	70.49%	65.50%	63.78%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	112.00	127.00	86.07%	79.50%	88.19%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Reasons for B Slippage

Note that an increase of 5.07% was noted for Category A, which is reflective of progress. It also indicates somewhat of a turning point from previous years in which fewer youth were enrolling in postsecondary education. It is of interest to speculate if this result was related somehow to the lower percentage of youth entering competitive employment in Category B which showed Slippage. One might speculate changes in these two categories may be an indicator of a growing U. S. economy which allows for more families to afford the costs of postsecondary education for their children. Hence, youth can defer entering into competitive employment (Category B) upon leaving secondary school. According to the 2018 College Readiness Report for Indiana, an increasing number of youth are, in fact, entering postsecondary education directly leaving high school than what was observed in previous years. However, the assumption that the lower percentages seen in the number of youth that entering competitive employment in favor of continuing their education in a higher education setting can only be supported by the types of trends that are observed over the ensuing years.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Youth selected for the original sample of 407 school leavers represented 15 IDOE eligibility codes. Codes selected by respondents included: Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Impairment, Blind or Low Vision, Deaf or Hard of Hearing Emotional Disability (Full-Time Placement), Emotional Disability (All Other Placements), Specific Learning Disability, Developmental Delay, Language or Speech Impairment, Mild Cognitive Disability, Moderate Cognitive Disability, Autism Spectrum Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Other Health Impairment.

Eligibility codes not represented in the returned surveys included Severe Cognitive Disability and Deaf-Blindness. Both of these eligibility categories are considered "low incidence" disabilities and represent populations of youth with disabilities which have a relatively low probability of being included in any sample selection process.

Indiana used "oversampling" to obtain the sample for FFY 2017. Oversampling is a term used to ensure that selected subgroups are provided with the opportunity to participate in a survey. It helps to reinforce equity by not penalizing youth who happen to represent low incidence eligibility categories. In this case, we used oversampling to ensure youth with all types of disabilities were included in the sample. For FFY 2017, we were able to reach individuals with disability codes representing every disability area except two Severe Cognitive Disability and Deaf-Blindness.

The selected sample originally consisted of 407 youth. Of this number, 133 respondents completed the survey, and 45 individuals exercised their option to refuse participation. The telephone survey interviewers failed to make contact with 229 individuals eligible to respond to the survey. In each case, interviewers tried to reach youth on three to five different occasions, depending on the likely availability of a qualified respondent. Changing telephone numbers, along with wrong phone numbers and individuals that did not answer the phone, accounted for a large number of those who could not be contacted.

One hundred twenty-seven (127) of the original 133 respondents were used for the survey. In this case, the gateway to meeting criteria is whether the respondent was to answer in the affirmative whether they graduated from high school. We had 6 of those individuals that stated they had not graduated from high school, in which case the interviewer discontinued the survey. Before doing so, however, the interviewer took the opportunity to ask respondents why they did not graduate. In most cases, respondent youth indicated they moved to another school. In addition to those who did not graduate, we also had 21 individuals that *did* graduate, but could not be assigned any of the four Data Input Types. These youth are generally referred to as "Not Engaged" but are nevertheless included in the total number of 127 "countable" responses.

Given the circumstances explained above, a valid return rate of 32.7% was calculated. This number was found to be five percentage points higher than the FFY2016 return rate of 27.7%. The FFY 2017 return rate percentage falls within the accepted return range recommended by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Center in FFY 2016" based on a report of Indicator 14 reviewed by the OSEP Division of Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP).

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The distribution of the sample data was representative of Indiana's 2016-2017 statewide 618 federal Child Count that is used to count the number of students with disabilities within one or more of the 15 disability codes recognized by the Indiana Department of Education for FFY 2017. The same is true of the respondents that completed the surveys. The distribution of disability eligibility categories of those responding to the survey is shown below. This table shows percentages in relation to the obtained sample compared with those of the Indiana 2016-2017 federal Child Count. To make these comparisons, we selected disability areas which included Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impaired, Autism Spectrum Disorders, Mild Cognitive Disability, and Emotional Disability (including youth in full-time placements and "All Other" types educational settings). These five disability areas alone account for about 90% of the special education population for secondary aged youth. The table shows that the obtained sample very well approximates what is observed in the statewide population. Similar results were noted in other lower incidence disability areas such as Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Orthopedic Impairment, and Traumatic Brain Injury where the incidence rates ranged from 1.4% to 0.4%. A chi-squared goodness of fit statistic also suggested representativeness. Criteria from the National Center for Postsecondary Outcomes were utilized.

	STATE PERCENTAGE	SAMPLE SIZE PERCENTAGE	NPSO CRITERION ¹
--	------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------

Specific Learning Disability	44.40%	42.50%	1.90%
------------------------------	--------	--------	-------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Other Health Impairment	16.10%	15.80%	0.30%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	10.60%	9.50%	1.10%
Mild Cognitive Disability	7.80%	7.90%	-0.10%
Emotional Disability (All Other)	5.50%	6.30%	-0.80%
Emotional Disability (Full-Time)	5.50%	6.30%	-2.10%

¹ Note: NPSO criterion of ± 3.0 is used to determine over-or under representation.

The results were also representative of the state's racial and ethnic demographics. As shown in the table below, the ethnicity category of White accounted for 71.7% of the sample, compared to the 618 Child Count population of 69.8% for youth 14 years of age and older. Black or African American comprised 14.2% of the sample, compared to a population percentage of 15.5%. Hispanic /Latino were represented by about 7.1% of respondents, whereas the percentage of this group was 8.9%. The remainder of the groups also are consistent with the percentages reported for their counterparts by the child count. A chi-squared goodness of fit test suggested representativeness.

Ethnicity	State	Sample	NPSO Criterion ¹
White	69.8%	71.7%	1.9%
Black	15.5%	14.2%	-1.3%
Hispanic Ethnicity and of any race	8.9%	7.1%	-1.8%
Multiracial (two or more races)	4.8%	5.5%	0.8%
Asian	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.3%	0.0%	-0.3%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

¹ Note: NPSO criterion of ± 3.0 is used to determine over-or under representation.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note the attached report by Systems Improvement Group, who performed this survey and analysis under contract with the Indiana Department of Education.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				30.60%	30.80%	31.00%	31.20%	31.40%	31.60%	72.50%	73.00%
Data		30.20%	94.00%	66.00%	71.00%	66.00%	83.33%	83.02%	73.33%	80.43%	82.61%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	73.50%	74.00%
Data	50.94%	35.09%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	74.50%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	15	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	75	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
15	75	35.09%	74.50%	20.00%

Reasons for Slippage

The Indiana Department of Education has recently adopted a new system for submission, management, and monitoring of dispute resolutions. This system has enabled improved reporting of all aspects of the dispute resolution process, including resolution session settlement agreements.

Experience and anecdotal evidence suggest that attorneys are increasingly advising parents of students in Indiana not to settle at the resolution session setting, though often a settlement or withdrawal will happen later. This, combined with increased data quality, likely explains the drop in the resolution rate observed last year, and continued this year with additional slippage.

Resolution before hearing happens in the vast majority of cases before hearing or due process decision. Requests for hearing being fully adjudicated is rare: of the 114 requests for hearing submitted during FFY2017, only 4 went to decision (31 were pending as of June 30).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			52.40%	52.60%	52.80%	53.00%	53.00%	53.40%	53.64%	74.50%	75.00%
Data		52.00%	82.00%	55.00%	69.20%	69.40%	59.38%	76.47%	76.19%	79.25%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	75.50%	76.00%
Data	88.33%	90.48%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	76.50%	77.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education has analyzed the data from past Annual Performance Reports to determine appropriate, achievable, yet rigorous targets for 2013-2018.

The Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education included stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), as well as other constituents, to set the targets submitted for 2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	6	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	42	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	56	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6	42	56	90.48%	76.50%	85.71%

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		45.16%	45.66%	46.16%	46.66%
Data	29.00%	45.16%		55.35%	61.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	52.84%

Key:

Description of Measure

Indiana has submitted the SSIP report via two attachments to GRADS 360:

SSIP PHASE III-Year 2-2019 Indiana SSIP Report

IN SSIP EVAL: IN SSIP 2018-2019 evaluation report_.pdf

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

April 1, 2015- Submitted during Phase I

Stakeholders were presented with proficiency trend data for both ISTEP+ (English/Language Arts) and IREAD-3 for the overall state and for the more limited purposeful sample group. As a SSIP Stakeholder Team, pros and cons of using different measures were considered, as well as different options for setting baselines and targets. Stakeholders voted on options, and the majority vote determined the baseline and targets.

The SSIP Stakeholder Team discussed setting more conservative targets because Indiana adopted new standards as a result of efforts to increase rigor for all students in Indiana through the adoption of college and career ready standards through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. This led to the need to align new standardized testing measures to these standards and subsequently new vendors to create these assessments. There were concerns about how these factors could have an effect on the outcome of data quality. Without consistent trend data over the past few years to set current baseline data or targets, stakeholders did not have the confidence to support more rigorous targets at this time. In addition to this, there was discussion around the challenges in predicting the amount of growth students within a small sample size could make in a short period of time. This logic led stakeholders to set conservative targets as initial goals. The expectation is that the targets will be evaluated and revised as the various factors stabilize and more data relative to the implementation of coherent improvement strategies is collected.

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) representatives and a broad scope of stakeholders from across Indiana focused their work on developing Indiana's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). SSIP Core Team members include: the Assistant Director of Special Education for IDOE, the Part B Data Manager for IDOE, an IDOE Education Specialist, and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) staff initially. The Core Team reviewed existing data, requested additional data runs, and analyzed the relationship between data elements and data sets. The Core Team set the agendas for SSIP Stakeholder Team meetings expanding on prior meetings, the next elements of Phase I, and areas that the SSIP Stakeholder Team felt needed to be addressed. For example, the stakeholders wanted to see additional data and wanted the data visualized differently, this led to further disaggregation of data for preparation for the next

SSIP Stakeholder Team meeting. The Core Team and the Part B Data Manager also set out timelines for specific tasks and provided necessary organization and processes on the SSIP tasks.

The SSIP Core Team expanded as the process of Phase I of the SSIP moved forward and other areas within IDOE were identified as key partners in the process for increasing outcomes for students with disabilities. This broader group of IDOE stakeholders is comprised of additional representatives from the Office of Special Education (OSE), specialists and the coordinator from Title 1, the director of Outreach, Reading Specialist from the Office of College and Career Ready, the director of School Accountability, and the director of Student Assessment. This diverse group of experienced leaders brings a wealth of educational experience from special education and general education settings, including building and district leaders, instructional coaches, and reading experts. The Leadership Team explored, discussed, and summarized statewide reading proficiency data for students with disabilities. The team also analyzed IDOE's current infrastructure capacity to support improvement strategies and student outcomes. Leadership Team members engaged in root

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

cause analysis discussions. A chart with stakeholder descriptions and involvement aligned to the SSIP Implementation Phases is attached for clarification.

Information and data regarding the SSIP and Phase 1 were presented at State Advisory Council meetings, the Indiana Association of School Psychologists' Annual Conference in Fall 2014, the Indiana Council for Special Education Administrators' Spring 2015 Conference, IDOE Outreach Coordinator Staff Training Fall 2015 Meeting and Indiana Resource Network meetings with program supervisors. All of these external stakeholder groups have provided feedback and guidance throughout the various aspects of the SSIP data analysis and infrastructure analysis process.

In addition to these groups, a formal stakeholder group (SSIP Stakeholder Team) was developed with the sole purpose of providing stakeholder engagement in the development and implementation of the SSIP. This group is comprised of representatives from the following organizations: Indiana's State Special Education Advisory Council; Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE); Indiana Association of School Principals; INSOURCE (a statewide parent support organization); and Project SUCCESS (a resource center developed and managed by Public Consulting Group (PCG)). In addition to the organization representatives, six teachers from various grades and disciplines (including special education and general education) from various geographical locations across the state are also members. This diverse group has participated in three formal in-person stakeholder meetings thus far and all members are part of a listserv which provides frequent updates on progress and opportunities for feedback. In person feedback is provided through meeting activities which provide opportunities for members to share in a variety of different modalities. Feedback from this group is also requested between meetings through email voting, as well as member participation in the SSIP Learning Connection Community.

Overview

See attached report

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

IDOE began the process of data analysis by collecting a comprehensive report of available assessment data from FFY 2009 through FFY 2012. Initially, any data reported that related in some capacity to students with disabilities and their performance on assessments was gathered for analysis. This included 618 data related to students with disabilities and their participation, performance on statewide assessments (both standard and alternate), as well as state data from the IREAD-3 assessment for the years it was available. This information was disaggregated by the individual tests (ISTEP+, IMAST, ISTAR, and IREAD-3) and shared with stakeholders through SSIP stakeholder meetings. The stakeholder group also analyzed data from prior and current State Performance Plans and Annual Performance Reports (SPP/APR).

Stakeholders were provided with raw data in regard to student results on assessments, including math and reading, as well as disaggregated data including bar graphs, pie charts and trend lines. The facilitator of the meetings led the discussion of the whole group, ensuring each stakeholder member had a common understanding of the data findings in order to understand the related needs based on these findings. The stakeholders were then asked to have conversations in small groups (each included a mix of the stakeholders, i.e. family representatives, teachers, administrators, state personnel). These conversations included discussions about potential data trends and possible implications from these trends. The discussion in both the large and small groups began with a broad analysis of the data then pointed discussion that helped to narrow the analysis process. Once the external stakeholder group had analyzed the data, the information was shared with an internal stakeholder group. The discussion with the internal group included identification of the current IDOE initiatives, such as college and career readiness, RTI/MTSS, and educator effectiveness. The group consensus was that the SSIP should be tied to an existing reading initiative, specifically the emphasis on students being college and career ready through the academic lens of reading. Through these discussions, it was determined by both internal and external stakeholders that Indiana should focus on student data related to reading proficiency. The group wanted to explore other data sources for potential trends and student performance on statewide assessments in the areas of reading and English language arts. Additionally, it was discussed and determined that as a means to leverage resources and partner with internal stakeholders within IDOE, it would be necessary to disaggregate data for schools that were in focus status as determined by Indiana's Federal ESEA Flexibility Waiver. This will provide additional opportunities for the OSE to collaborate in order to meet broad strategic goals of the Department and meet the needs of all students in order to increase proficiency. Through trend analysis, a "purposeful sample group" of the schools in focus status was identified as the group for determining the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR), for gauging potential root causes contributing to low performance, and for establishing a model of selection for the SSIP schools for the implementation in Phase III.

In addition to the extensive quantitative analysis of data which helped the stakeholder groups set an initial focal point, qualitative analysis was done as well. Leadership and Core Teams from the OSE, Title 1, and Outreach programs worked collaboratively to conduct focus group surveys of schools within the purposeful sample group. These surveys were conducted through a combination of on-site, in-person interviews with key staff members (those involved in providing reading instruction or intervention to students with disabilities at schools) in the purposeful sample group, as well as through online questionnaires with additional staff and parents. This information

then was used to identify root causes that contribute to low performance in reading and English language arts.

Trend analysis of historical assessment information for all of the Indiana assessment tools were included in the data review and focused on the disaggregation of data by district: disability, placement (LRE), ethnicity, poverty (free/reduced lunch status, Title 1 eligibility), and EL status. This resulted in an abundance of both raw data and data visualizations. As one of the goals of the SSIP is to break down silos between the various IDOE departments, OSE worked closely with Title I and Outreach to collaborate on a shared vision. A purposeful sample group of buildings in focus status was developed to assist in narrowing the scope of data to review and look for common trends among similar schools. The sample was limited to schools that were identified under Indiana's Federal Accountability Waiver as schools that received a "D" or "F" school designation and are considered to be in federal school improvement status. If a school received a "D" in 2012-2013, that school was classified as a focus school in 2013-2014. In order to ensure a broad representation for root cause analysis and later scaling up, the purposeful sample group included schools from large, medium and small LEAs as well as representation from various geographical locations across the state. Through internal and external stakeholder discussions, the pros and cons of working with either "D" or "F" schools was debated. Through this debate, it was decided that in order to gather information on schools that were in need, but still had a foundational infrastructure for support, the selection for LEAs would be limited to LEAs with at least one, but less than four, focus elementary schools. The rationale used for this formula was that LEAs with greater than four focus elementary schools could limit the initial capacity for implementation in Phase III and could imply that these districts had more LEA systemic challenges that would impact building infrastructure support. A discussion also ensued as to why focus schools and not priority schools were selected for the sample group. A comment from a stakeholder (who is a parent advocate) was taken into consideration by the external stakeholders when the discussion started with the assumption that priority schools would be the target sample group. This insight shed light on the possibility that priority schools likely had many issues impacting student learning both at the school and LEA levels. The group was challenged to think about what Indiana hopes to accomplish through the SSIP and how available resources and measurable student outcomes could be affected if the challenges to the school/LEA infrastructure were massive: Would there be capacity to implement the changes? Could team structures be identified within these schools?

After substantial dialogue and debate, the stakeholder group determined that focus schools were not only in need of intervention and support, but were also likely to have the foundational infrastructure to support implementation and sustain change for the long-term. It was determined that focus schools would become the purposeful sample.

Indiana does not have issues with data quality as far as data being incomplete or incorrect. However, Indiana has experienced transition with regard to Indiana Academic Standards:

- Indiana adopted Common Core standards in 2010.
- Indiana General Assembly enacted legislation precluding Indiana's use of Common Core standards in March 2014.
- Legislation required that new College and Career Ready standards be adopted by the State Board of Education by July 1, 2014.

Subsequently, Indiana has revised its statewide assessments over the past three years. Indiana has used ISTEP+ for the regular assessment, Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test (IMAST) for the modified assessment, and ISTAR for the alternate assessment.

IMAST was discontinued after the 2013-2014 school year, and the ISTEP+ and ISTAR assessments required revisions in order to align with the college and career ready standards. The Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Governor, and the Indiana State Board of Education continue to have conversations regarding the Indiana Academic Standards and Assessments. The impact of these transitions translates into data discrepancies between years and will impact future data comparisons. Additionally, with the elimination of the modified assessment (2% assessment, IMAST), additional students will be assessed using ISTEP+ which could impact statewide performance data. This, coupled with changes in assessment vendors, could have an impact on data reliability.

In an effort to assist with the potential for unreliable data, it was determined that IDOE will use the IREAD-3 assessment given to third grade students as the measure for student performance for the SSIP. This assessment has not been effected by the changes to standards or vendors that the standardized assessment has experienced. This will allow IDOE to identify reliable baseline measures and set realistic targets for student achievement without waiting for new data to be collected over several testing windows as the new assessment is introduced.

It is anticipated that there will be data variability with the IREAD-3 assessment due to the fact that different third grade students are evaluated every year. The evaluation plan in Phase II will address this possible issue. Initial discussion has prompted the idea of tracking student cohorts, i.e. third grade students in year one of implementation as they advance in grades, kindergarten students who will be recipients of the coherent improvement strategies, etc.

The OSE provided trend information to the stakeholders on each of the federal indicators including both compliance and results indicators. The data was reviewed to identify possible areas of impact on the SSIP. No foreseeable issues were brought up by the external stakeholder group, however, conversation continued within the OSE. None of the data, in regard to indicators, stand out as barriers to the implementation of the SSIP. However, as the buildings begin to execute the SSIP at a local level the data will need to be analyzed specifically for any root cause possibilities. For example, if any discipline or special education identification disproportionality issues exist, the data will need to be reviewed, and local plans may need to include strategies to address the issue(s). Indicator 5, least restrictive environment (LRE), could also play a part in the coherent strategies that are put in place at a local level, adjusting service delivery and continuum options and providing training if there are issues related to LRE identified through the root cause analysis. As the implementation phase of the SSIP nears, Indiana will need to align any findings of non-compliance or any LEA outcomes that do not meet state targets for results indicators that may be present in the buildings to coherent improvement strategies and initiatives being implemented.

After the initial submission of Phase I of the SSIP for Indiana, there were several factors that led to the need to revisit the data analysis process and reset both baseline data and targets for the future goals of the Indiana SIMR. During the 2013-14 school year, Indiana adopted new standards, which led to a more rigorous assessment of these standards across all assessments, including the IREAD3 Assessment. This also led to an almost 10% decline in proficiency scores for the IREAD3 for all students, and subgroups of students, including those with disabilities. Given this change in standards and subsequent performance dip, it was approved by OSEP TA providers that Indiana could reset the baseline measure for the SSIP SIMR using the 2014 IREAD3 data. Additionally, the target group of students for the SIMR changed based on the State Development Network (SDN) infrastructure. The new targeted group of students, is a larger sample size of students including all students with disabilities, receiving free and reduced lunch attending elementary schools within the SDN Cohort 1. This includes sixty three elementary schools and approximately 945 students out of the 1,147 total number of third graders with disabilities in these schools. The comprehensive SSIP Stakeholder group was included in analysis of the updated data using the IREAD3 2014 data set, and the SDN 3rd grade data for students with disabilities. Stakeholders evaluated achievement gap data, and helped to determine the appropriate parameters for setting future targets based on the identified trends within the SDN student data. Stakeholders felt it was important to consider the impact of significant achievement gaps within certain racial and ethnic groups even though the data showed that across all subgroups, students receiving free/reduced lunch underperformed compared to their peers receiving paid lunch. A discrepancy in performance between students receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch was also shown within overall statewide data. Both of these gave support to the emphasis on Indiana's State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) being focused on students with disabilities in the SDN schools that receive free/reduced lunch. Also within the SDN disaggregate data, African American students with disabilities receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch had an overall performance rate on the IREAD3 that was significantly lower than both the state average, and the performance of all other subgroups of students with disabilities within the SDN. Additionally, white students with disabilities had the largest gap of performance between students receiving paid and free/reduced lunch. The performance of these two subgroups were used as the parameters for setting the target. The overall performance of both white and African American students receiving paid lunch for this data report was used as a means of setting parameters for the overall growth target for the SSIP. Incremental growth of .5% is expected for the first years of SSIP Implementation, based on the indirect influence of practices that are being implemented both within the SDN Site schools and the primary support of the LEA participation within the State Development Network. It is expected that the students that have received SSIP Implementation support from K-3rd grade will demonstrate a significant amount of growth and this will be shown during the FFY19 IREAD3 assessment year. Additionally, it is the goal of Indiana to scale up implementation and share the lessons learned through this model both within the SDN and across the state. It is possible that growth from participation in SDN related activities or from shared professional learning around the SSIP Partnering LEAs and Site Schools will result in a greater rate of performance than anticipated.

Please refer to Appendix F-Data Analysis Update within the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation which includes disaggregated data used by stakeholders, as well as an explanation of the new baseline and targeted goals for improvement over Phase III

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

April 1, 2015-Submission of Phase I Report-

IDOE analyzed State infrastructure through a variety of qualitative data analysis methods. The core and leadership teams met regularly to conceive opportunities to leverage resources and to review data that reflected the state infrastructure. Additionally, members of the core team met with external stakeholder groups to garner feedback related to state infrastructure. A formal SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis process was completed (using resources and recommendations from the RRCP SWOT Analysis and State Infrastructure Analysis Toolkit) with the official SSIP Stakeholder Team and with internal IDOE staff to determine strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that would have an impact on the SIMR and SSIP relative to the state infrastructure.

There are existing supports currently available to LEAs and school personnel. The following are examples of infrastructure supports that are available for LEAs/buildings:

Indiana has a waiver from certain aspects of the federal No Child Left Behind law. This gives local schools continued flexibility in how federal funding is utilized and allows more funding decisions to be made at the local level.

The federally funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers program provides at-risk students a safe environment during non-school hours. A range of high quality services to support regular school-day academics and development are provided, including tutoring and mentoring, academic enrichment, and character education.

The "Learning Connection" is an online tool developed by IDOE that plays a prominent role in supporting the implementation of Indiana's strategic initiatives. By providing data, resources, and tools for school improvement, the functionality of the Learning Connection can be leveraged across IDOE initiatives aimed at improving student learning. The Learning Connection includes: communities for professional collaboration; a library to create lessons and school activities, a class workspace to schedule events, lessons, and learning activities; the creation of reports (individual student and class) of achievement; and a means by which parents/students can access school or corporation information.

The Office of Student Services provides resources including assistance for chronic absenteeism, prevention of bullying, school climate and cultural awareness, school counseling and guidance, and military children and family resources.

Resources are provided for parents/families through different divisions within IDOE.

The Office of Special Education has the Indiana Resource Network comprised of centers that provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the state to improve teaching and learning:

- o Over 98% of the LEAs utilize the "Indiana IEP" online to develop legally compliant Individualized Education Programs. Technical assistance and professional development for Indiana educators is offered in the development and use of procedures to ensure compliance and fidelity of IEP goal implementation.
- o The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Resource Center increases educator knowledge and understanding of how PBIS impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate and least restrictive environments.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Project SUCCESS supports teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- IN*SOURCE, utilizing a proven parent-to-parent model, has provided assistance, support services, and educational resources to the community of individuals and organizations that serve and support persons with disabilities.
- The PATINS Project is a statewide technical assistance network that provides accessible technology for assisting LEAs in the utilization and creation of accessible learning environments and instructional materials. A focus for the PATINS Project will include Universal Design for Learning.
- The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center focuses on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and family involvement.

Detailed reports are attached that reflect the infrastructure analyses that were completed. Indiana would like to draw the reader's attention to the 'discussion' portion of the reports that provide an overview of the analyses that were completed. Also attached are two reports which detail Indiana's current strengths, the extent the systems are coordinated, and the areas for improvement within and across the systems (PDFs of SWOT Reports which detail descriptions of SWOT for each area of state infrastructure).

The Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction has clearly laid out the IDOE initiatives as follows:

"We are dedicated to providing the highest quality of support to Indiana's schools, teachers, students and parents. We are working with educators, policy makers, business leaders, and community based organizations to achieve our mission to build an education system of high quality and equity that is focused on student-centered accountability.

The Indiana Department of Education is using a community approach to educating our children and in building support systems for our schools. No matter where children live in our state, they should enter schools that have equity in resources and the expectation they will receive a high quality education. We have established the division of Outreach for School Improvement to embrace this philosophy and approach to ensuring continuous and measurable improvement for both our students and schools."

The Office of Special Education's new State Director of Special Education presented her goals during the keynote at a recent Indiana Inclusion Conference:

"I am passionate about the importance of growing inclusive schools. In this age of racial unrest and radical extremists, it becomes even more paramount that students are taught in schools where tolerance is expected and diversity is welcome.

We started this conversation years ago. With the onset of PL94-142, followed by IDEA... the push for mainstreaming in the 70s and the regular ed. initiative of the 80s...these all nudged schools to have students with disabilities in classrooms and buildings with their same age peers. I often wonder why after all this time we still find pockets of resistance to meeting the needs of all students without classifying some of them and separating them from the masses. Why, with all of the technology, research and highly qualified teachers do we still accept the notion that some students don't belong in a particular classroom, school or community. I guess the answer is...institutional change takes time and it takes commitment and it takes a champion or two to take risks and bring people along. My hope for all of you over the next two days is that you leave feeling confident and motivated to truly embrace all students' abilities and talents and skills, I hope you continue promoting high expectations for all students and I hope you re-dedicate your career to making a lasting change."

As IDOE analyzed state plans that are currently in place for schools in Indiana, there are also plans that are required by schools based upon varying factors. All schools submit Schoolwide Improvement Plans; this is a required component for accreditation in an effort to assist schools in continuous strategic school improvement initiatives. Additionally, all schools with students in grades K-4 are required to submit Reading Plans. If a school is in focus or priority status, they must also submit a Student Achievement Plan. Lastly, if schools receive Title 1 funds, they must submit Title 1 Plans. The opportunity to align all of these plans with the SSIP exists. It is an expectation of IDOE that through each step of the SSIP, the cohesion and coordination of services will be aligned through these plans and initiatives. The partnership between the offices within IDOE through Outreach, Title 1, and special education, along with the current IDOE initiative to coordinate the elements of each plan into one, will allow for continuity and will reduce redundancy in schools.

As part of the final process for developing the SIMR and analyzing the state infrastructure, IDOE reviewed the SWOT Analysis reports with the SSIP stakeholder group through a formal text rendering process and discussion. This cooperative sharing experience allowed the members of the formal stakeholder group to reflect on significant points from the SWOT process and to consider the various areas of the state infrastructure that could have shared strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or threats that could be either capitalized on, or developed for further planning purposes. The main standout points as far as weaknesses and opportunities that were brought to the forefront of the discussion for emphasis are in the areas of Technical Assistance/Professional Development and Data and reference the three "C's: Capacity, Cohesion, and Communication."

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

Following the submission of Phase I of the SSIP, the Division of School Improvement began considering additional ways to support LEAs at a district level in order to improve systemic alignment and work cohesively to address schools in need of improvement. This led to the creation of the Indiana State Development Network of districts that are committed to participating in a transformational community that is deeply focused on building an education system of high quality and equity in Title I served schools. This initiative was modeled after the State Development Network model that Indiana had been participating in at an SEA level through support of Mass Insight. The first cohort of LEAs that were able to participate in this support were selected based on their designation as Title 1 eligible districts with an intensive focus on supporting their schools that were designated as Focus or Priority Schools in need of improvement. Members of the SDN will continue to receive the following supports:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Increased technical assistance and professional development.
- Access to IDOE experts and on-site work days
- Network of Resources including peers with similar goals and high performing districts
- Priority access on grant approval and amendments
- Assignment of a case manager to provide guidance and support
- Opportunities to participate in intensive summer professional development

The first cohort of the SDN received additional reallocated Title 1 funds and state turnaround dollars to support the implementation of a high quality district improvement plan. Professional Development and Technical Assistance support for this was offered in August 2015, and then continued on a quarterly cycle with additional follow-up support made by Case Managers on a monthly basis. Given the intentional support for school improvement that this structure provides as well as the opportunity for collaboration across all offices of the Division of School Improvement, our core team for the SSIP decided to seek the approval for the selection of schools for implementation of the SSIP to be from the SDN districts. This would allow for additional supports and cross collaboration throughout IDOE. Approval and collaboration for this partnership was received welcomingly, and this even led to an additional pilot school partner being selected from one of the Cohort I LEAs.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

April 1, 2016-Phase II Submission- Revision to Phase I:

The SIMR is based upon improving student performance in reading, which aligns to Indicator 3- student performance on statewide assessment.

The State Identified Measureable Result for Indiana:

Previous SIMR: Indiana will increase reading proficiency achievement on Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment by at least .5% each year for 3rd grade students with disabilities eligible for free/reduced lunch attending elementary schools within the State Development Network Districts.

Current (4/1/2019) SIMR (Revised per stakeholder input and DOE administrative changes)

Indiana will increase reading proficiency achievement on Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment by at least .5% each year for all 3rd grade students including those with disabilities attending elementary schools participating in the Indiana SSIP initiatives.

Description

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

In order to determine the SIMR, disaggregated data for reading performance by area of exceptionality, LRE, race, school lunch status, and gender were shared and displayed for the stakeholder groups to review for trend implications. A graphic representation of each of the disaggregation displays of this data is attached. The data indicated that students with language and speech impairments and specific learning disabilities in the purposeful sample group were the largest areas of exceptionalities represented. In a disaggregation of data for all students with disabilities in Indiana who did not demonstrate proficiency in passing statewide assessments in English language arts/reading, students with specific learning disabilities did not meet proficiency expectations. 77% of students with specific learning disabilities are receiving their instruction in a general education setting for 80% or more of the day, 22% receive their instruction in a resource room setting, and only 2% of those students are receiving instruction in a self-contained special education setting. When comparing the racial demographics of the purposeful sample group to their general education peers within the LEAs they reside within, the data was comparable. Therefore, there did not appear to be any implication related to race for the purposeful sample group. In both state and purposeful sample data, there are significantly more male students than female students identified with specific learning disabilities in third grade. Also significant for the development of the SIMR is the impact of poverty as related through school lunch status. 73% of the students in the purposeful sample group receive free lunch. After analyzing the graphic displays of the data and the trend implications, the stakeholders discussed how these implications could be developed as a State Identified Measureable Result. Stakeholders agreed to an initial SIMR that focused on improvement of reading outcomes for third and fourth grade male students identified with specific learning disabilities receiving free lunch. After it was determined that the most reliable measurement tool for determining baseline and targets and measuring future growth would be Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment, this further narrowed the focus to third grade students since IREAD-3 is given only to third graders.

Given the emphasis from both the state legislature and IDOE to improve college and career readiness outcomes for students in Indiana, there is a clear alignment between the Indiana SIMR and state initiatives which focuses on increasing reading outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities in third grade. The State's commitment to reading is evident in a letter below signed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction that includes an explanation of the "Hoosier Family of Readers":

"Dear Parents and Community Supporters,

During our busy days, finding time to read can be a challenge. I hope that you are able to find the time to read with the young people in your life. The Hoosier Family of Readers is an initiative to build a culture of readers in Indiana. A reading family can be any combination of caring adults and children, reading together at home, a neighborhood library or out of school at places like the Boys and Girls Club, YMCA or scouts.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

We encourage all of our reading families to read anything that interests them—including graphic novels, non-fiction books, magazines, and newspapers – whether online or in print. We suggest that they:

- Read with someone
- Read to someone
- Share with someone what he/she has read
- Listen to someone read
- Help others read
- Read independently

Our Hoosier Family of Readers welcomes the Indiana National Guard as our new reading partner in Books & Boots. Active duty members of the National Guard are going to schools around Indiana to help students read and learn! We are happy to welcome them to our Hoosier Family of Readers.

If you are a member of a community group wanting to help with this reading initiative, please contact hoosierreaders@doe.in.gov (link sends e-mail) and let us know about your group and how you would like to support the Hoosier Family of Readers.

Remember, a reader is not simply someone who can read; a reader is someone who does read.”

As described previously, Indiana collected and analyzed data from a number of resources, conducting both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The stakeholder groups, during the initial presentation of information, engaged in thoughtful and deliberate discussion which resulted in the collection of further data and analysis. The new information was then analyzed along with the initial information, and the stakeholder groups ultimately crafted the SIMR.

It is Indiana’s belief that the student centered outcome has been evident in all elements of the first phase of the SSIP. The stakeholder groups keep the focus of all conversations on the student who is learning. This has been evident through the focused work of student centered outcomes achieved by breaking down silos, including parents, teachers, Title 1, Outreach, Assessment, and Accountability. The students are the center of the work. A tool that has been developed for use by the administrators of the pilot and implementation buildings (to begin in Phase II) that lists each target student individually and the various ‘categories’ of support that are available to that student either through a funding source or building/LEA initiative. The tool also lists the individual student results on assessments to ensure that there is a baseline of information for measurement purposes.

Indiana chose the SIMR using a deliberate and intentional method of selection focusing first on leveraging the IDOE-wide reading initiative to ensure that the office of special education was supporting those efforts for students with disabilities being implemented as ‘students’ first. To support these students, Indiana followed the guidance offered through the OSEP funded technical assistance centers, the various conference calls, webinars and technical assistance opportunities: “start small and scale up”.

Though an argument could be made to focus on any particular group of students with disabilities, Indiana chose to concentrate on a group of students in a disability category with a higher incidence in the state. In order to effectively partner with various divisions within the IDOE, the OSE looked to partner with Title I and Outreach. Those divisions were already working with the focus and priority schools, and when the data were reviewed, it was found that the male students with specific learning disabilities were a group that needed assistance. With the selection of the SIMR based on impact of students with the highest incidence disability category in both the purposeful sample group and in the state, it provides an opportunity to implement evidence-based practices for improving outcomes that can be scaled up to a group that is also affected at a state level and has overall impact on state data and performance.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I

The SSIP is part of a larger IDOE initiative through the State Development Network. This partnership focuses on struggling learners as a whole. Due to this emphasis, stakeholders reviewed additional data and determined that the SIMR should include a broader student demographic group instead of the original focus on male students with specific learning disabilities.

Please review the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation-IN-SSIP for additional explanation.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

During the initial phases of SSIP development, IDOE established an Instructional Practices Advisory Committee to identify the evidence-based instructional strategies within early literacy instruction, as well as high-leverage practices that, when applied across content, improve student learning. This group met on multiple occasions, under the direction of the IDOE with support from the National Center on Systemic Improvement, to collaboratively review the research and identify the evidence-based and high-level instructional strategies that, if applied with fidelity, will most likely improve student literacy performance. Likewise, this group considered how to purposefully align SSIP work to the existing requirements and support under the SDN. For example, the SSIP specifically focused on leadership capacity to support both school turn around and inclusive school cultures. Furthermore, and most impressive, the team connected ongoing school turnaround efforts to review and revise the state’s RTI guidance and align it with the framework for Multi-tiered Systems of Support. MTSS will be supported by the SSIP team using the work of the department as a guideline. As demonstrated within the SSIP logic model, MTSS establishes the infrastructure to both promote school turn around efforts and the implementation of evidence-based and high-leverage practices with fidelity. A complete listing of the advisory committee’s menu of approved instructional practices can be found within Appendix C of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

4/1/2019 - Please see the attached report for the Theory of Action Graphic

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

The Theory of Action developed during Phase I was revised by the Indiana SSIP Core Team based on OSEP guidance and input from Stakeholders and the National Center for Systemic Improvement to ensure that the clear articulation of coherent improvement activities and roles of each layer of the infrastructure from State Education Agency to Local Education Agency to building leader to teacher was clearly identified.

A Logic Model and alignment document was also developed during Phase II to further clarify specific activities, and short, medium, and long term measures of success.

Indiana would like to thank the staff from the federally funded National Center for Systemic Improvement and their collaborative TA partners that have spent the year assisting the Indiana SSIP Core Team in ensuring the process was both deliberate and focused and that IDOE met the goals and requirements outlined by OSEP.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

Indiana has been intentionally focused on systems alignment from the State Education Agency level cascading through to the LEA and school levels. Within the Indiana Department of Education(IDOE), systems alignment work has been supported through an organizational change, combining all offices focused on school improvement, including the Office of Special Education under one division. The directors of each office within the Division meet and will continue to meet weekly as a leadership team to work toward common goals guided by the IDOE Strategic Plan. The offices are now sharing and will continue to share the SSIP work as well as other initiatives. This cross office collaboration led to the creation of the State Development Network (SDN) focused on increasing capacity at the district level for LEAs and system alignment for LEAs. Additionally, this collaboration has led to forming multiple task forces focused on initiatives such as the development of a task force within IDOE to begin work on reviewing and revising current RTI guidance to align with the framework for Multi-tiered Systems of Support and a task force to provide statewide recognition for schools implementing successful "Promising Practices". These activities all demonstrate a quilting of silos at the state level to support improved practices and overall student outcomes at the local level.

The new organizational structure within IDOE will ensure ongoing communication and problem solving among offices. The common goal of school improvement encompasses the SSIP work. The IDOE website provides numerous resources which will allow for sustainable support for the SSIP at both the universal and targeted levels. Additionally, the collaborative work among offices will provide structure for future scaling up outside of the SDN. The established special education Indiana Resource Network (IRN) will meet quarterly to plan the provision of PD and TA to the SSIP schools focusing on instructional support of students with disabilities. Finally, planned TA to SDN site schools will provide sustainable support for the implementation of the identified coherent improvement strategies that align specifically to the SDN site schools participating in the SSIP.

Currently in Indiana, all schools are required to complete School Improvement Plans (SIP).Those schools identified as priority or focus schools are required to complete Student Achievement Plans (SAP). In addition, all elementary schools in Indiana are required to submit Reading Plans that identify the reading instruction and targets for supporting students at risk. Finally, the State Development Network (SDN) requires that all districts participating in this initiative complete a High Quality Plan (HQP) identifying systemic alignment and improvement activities. Each of these plans focus on how to improve student outcomes, including outcomes for students with disabilities.

As a means to leverage and align the current required plans (HQP, SIP, SAP, and Reading Plans) with the SSIP work, site schools will be required to include goals that are focused on professional development, technical assistance, and evidenced based practices for instruction that will be implemented to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and struggling learners. The work to ensure continuity among all plans will be a focal point of the SSIP support provided to schools and LEAs.

The infrastructure changes to support the SSIP have already begun within the structure of the State Development Network. The LEAs that agree to be Partnering LEAs and designate site schools for SSIP implementation will have additional requirements for aligning all plans, and maximizing the additional SDN funding in part or whole to support this work. A core group of Directors and Specialists from various Offices within the Division of School Improvement will meet frequently to assess the need for additional changes in infrastructure.

The IDOE MTSS task force has submitted the final recommendations for guidance and this initiative is currently in its final stages of planning. The goal for introducing the MTSS framework, website launch and additional Professional Development Summits are still in the planning and approval stages. It is not certain when the IDOE supported MTSS Initiative will be launched. However, support for MTSS as an Evidence Based Practice will continue to be a foundation of the SSIP site school work.

Capacity building for systemic alignment within the SDN and site schools has also already begun. The LEAs have participated in intentionally planned PD for the district level staff focused on Data, Leadership and Instruction. The SSIP Instructional Practices Advisory Council has identified common language competencies and will present these to the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) providers to ensure that all SSIP schools are receiving the same guidance and support to improve outcomes as planning for implementation occurs.

The structure of the Indiana Department of Education allows for an easier collaboration among offices. IDOE is divided into two structures to support schools. These are the Division of School Improvement, and the Division of Support Services. The members of the Core Team for the implementation of the SSIP include members from the Office of Special Education, Office of Outreach, Office of Early Learning and School Improvement Grants. Each of these offices is included in the Division for School Improvement and report to the Assistant Superintendent for Division of School Improvement. These members bring a diverse perspective that helps to support the goals of the SSIP. Additionally, the Key Advisors to the SSIP Core Team include members from the State Development Network Districts, the Leadership Team for all of the offices within the Division of School Improvement, the Case Managers for the SDN Districts, College and Career Ready Office, Early Learning and Intervention Office, the Indiana Resource Network providers, and the pilot school within the SDN. Additional extended participants include representatives from the fiscal offices within Part B, Title 1 and state funds, the Executive Team for the Department of Education, parent support network, and individual Outreach Coordinators, the Special Education Advisory Council, the Indiana Council of Administrators, general and special education teachers, members from the Office of Student Assessment, and members from the Office of Accountability. Members from both the key advisors and feedback networks participate in formal and informal stakeholder meetings and will provide varying levels of support to improve the state infrastructure. Stakeholders have been involved in the development of specific plans and support for implementation through their involvement on the SSIP Stakeholder committee, or Instructional Practices Advisory Council. Many of these same members have also been involved in the development of the MTSS statewide supports, and are also supporting systemic alignment within the State Development Networks. Through the evaluation of implementation and measures of student's outcomes, varying members will continue to participate in providing feedback to the SSIP during Phase III.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

The support for implementation of the evidence based practices is embedded in several tiers. In the first tier, LEAs within the State Development Network (SDN) will receive guidance and professional development focused on system alignment and evidence based practices to support all eight *Turnaround Principles*. Each LEA is provided a Case Manager who completes monthly check in calls highlighting specific systemic alignment practices and Turnaround Principles. The Case Managers also assist with providing resources and technical assistance to guide their implementation of the district wide High Quality Plan (HQP).

In the second tier, LEAs with SSIP site schools will receive additional intensive technical assistance to develop and align district goals and implementation planning within the district High Quality Plan (HQP), School Improvement Plan (SIP) or Student Achievement Plan (SAP) and Reading Plan. The SDN districts will meet quarterly with IDOE staff and additional resource providers to receive intentional and targeted PD to support the development and coordination of systemic alignment. Each PD session provided to the SDN offers Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) for district improvement in three key *Turnaround Principles*: Leadership, Data, and Instruction.

In the third tier of support, site schools within the SDN will receive the most intensive assistance for implementation of the SSIP. They will receive technical assistance for MTSS implementation beginning during the 2016-17 SY, and assistance developing and aligning their district HQP to specific areas of Root Cause within their individual schools. The site schools will receive an on-site visit focused on determining potential areas of root cause for poor reading achievement outcomes for students with disabilities and struggling learners. During the Root Cause Analysis on-site visit, classroom observations during reading instruction in grades K-3 will be completed, along with interviews of all providers of reading instruction, or reading interventions. This visit will be followed up with the building leaders completing a Partner's Inventory aligned to the *Turnaround Principles* with district level administrator support. The findings from this visit will be shared with school and district level staff via a formal report with recommendations aligned to the areas of root cause and the menu of EBPs that were identified as high leverage practices by the Instructional Practices Advisory Council for the SSIP. Coordinated technical assistance and professional development will be embedded within all the district and school required plans based on these recommendations and LEA and school leader decisions.

IDOE used a group of stakeholders, (Instructional Practices Advisory Committee) to review the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) that were identified by the National Center for Systemic Improvement as "high leverage" practices for addressing the areas of root cause that were identified during PHASE I. Additionally, all of these practices were evaluated based on their capacity to meet the needs of all students, including those with disabilities or struggling to learn, by upholding rigorous academic standards and high expectations for all. These practices were in support of improving quality reading instruction, improving early literacy instruction, and increasing high expectations within leaders and teachers for students with disabilities and struggling learners. Additional research for best practices was provided for systemic alignment, and Multi-tiered Systems of Support. The Instructional Practices Advisory Council (IPAC), included experts from IDOE in the area of Reading, Early Learning, Outreach, and Special Education, as well as outside experts in the area of PBIS, UDL and Inclusive Practices. This team reviewed each practice and selected practices based on their alignment to the areas of needs, potential for successful implementation and support for improving outcomes for students with disabilities with regard to the Indiana's State Identified Measureable Result (SiMR). It was determined through the activities of the pilot school that providing a menu of these practices within the Root Cause Analysis (RCA) visit report that align specifically to the needs of the school would allow for individual school autonomy and would address possible adaptive challenges.

The following bulleted points identify the requisite Implementation Drivers or the key components of capacity building and infrastructure development that will influence successful implementation of the SSIP in Indiana. These are the core components needed to initiate and support classroom, building, and district level change. These have been identified as possible drivers that may vary depending on the individual needs of the districts, schools, and classrooms that are participating in the SSIP. The SSIP Core team within each site school will evaluate their planning for implementation and individual selection of EBPs against the Implementation Driver rubric. Identified levels of support for implementation within each driver for the selected EBPs will be contingent on the specific site school needs and this evaluation process. These drivers will be evaluated after the completion of the RCA visit report, and during the development of the HQP and site school's SIP and Reading Plans.

- **Competency Drivers:**
 - Recruitment/Selection of Staff (within current school infrastructure or outside, coaches, leaders, etc.) to utilize EBPs
 - Training needs for staff around use of EBPs
 - Coaching needs to support implementation and fidelity of EBPs use
 - Performance and Assessment of Fidelity of implementation of EBPs
- **Organization Drivers:**
 - Decision/ Support Data Systems that will ensure outcomes of implementation, both with regard to fidelity of implementation, and students outcomes related to the selected EBPs
 - Facilitative Administrative Supports needed for EBPs (implementation team structure, policies and procedures, use/utilization of data to inform work, reduction of barriers)
 - Systems Intervention, what is needed to address barriers within the system for implementation of the EBPs, protocols, and leadership capacity
- **Leadership Drivers:**
 - Technical Leadership needs related to the implementation of selected EBPs (reasons for changes, guidance for expectations and clarity about what needs to be done)
 - Adaptive Leadership needs with alignment of the implementation of selected EBPs to the goals, vision and mission of the LEA, and school, and levels of communication to meet needs of staff.

In order to provide the TA/PD needed to support the implementation of the EBPs that a site school has selected, IDOE will work collaboratively with the Key Advisors to identify which supports would align best to the selected EBPs and RCA needs as well as the evaluation of the Drivers for Implementation of those EBPs selected. The additional TA/PD required to support the selected EBP will be provided in combination by the Indiana Resource Network staff, or possibly by an outside PD provider if this is appropriate. See the Menu of Evidence Based Practices found in Appendix B of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation. IDOE will provide support to the site school SSIP teams for planning and ongoing implementation evaluation. IDOE SSIP Core Team members will participate in monthly SDN and SSIP calls with site schools to ensure effective implementation of all plans that support SSIP goals.

As a part of the SSIP implementation process, regular evaluation of the Partnering LEAs and SSIP site schools' plans and practices will be reviewed. As progress with implementation drivers is made, additional scaling up of the practices will be supported. Additionally, information regarding the outcomes of these practices will be shared within the SDN and also through the Promising Practices- Making It Happen initiative as a means to encourage non-SDN LEAs/ schools to consider these practices as a means to improve outcomes for all students.

Please see the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation- IN-SSIP- specific steps and tools that will be used during each step of implementation can be found within this comprehensive manual.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

Indiana has utilized the Leading by Convening tools for engaging stakeholders. Specifically identifying circles of participation and potential roles that various stakeholders can play in the Indiana SSIP. It is through these tools that additional stakeholders have continued to be identified and will continue to be identified as the SSIP plan begins to move into Phase III within the partner LEAs and site schools involved in the SSIP. The large group feedback network identified as the SSIP Stakeholder Committee has met quarterly during Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP implementation process. Members of this group were initially invited to participate during Phase I as representatives of various education organizations, parent support organizations, IDOE departments, and education related roles. Members have continued to be added as the planning has evolved during Phase II. It is 6/24/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

planned that this large group will continue to meet quarterly either in person or virtually in order to review and gather evaluation feedback for Phase III of implementation. As evidenced in the visual display of the Indiana SSIP Circles of Participation, varying stakeholders are part of this feedback network and also play other roles.

Implementation and outcomes will be measured with data sources including interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders; professional development and meetings; review of process documents and records including professional development material; school demographic data; student performance results including benchmark assessments, and results on state standardized tests.

During the infrastructure analysis conducted in Phase I and development of the TOA, Indiana identified the SDN as an existing initiative that will be used to support the collection of data related to implementation of EBPs and the impact on student performance. Indiana reviewed data extensively to determine SSIP sample group within the SDN is representative of the state population. This data will continue to be reviewed, with the support of an external evaluator, to ensure consistency. Each time data is collected, the criteria will be analyzed according to short, medium and long term outcomes. In addition, current SDN protocols used for data collection are being reviewed and aligned to accurately reflect the data collection requirements of the SSIP and SIMR.

The SSIP process and intended outcomes will be continuously evaluated throughout implementation. Feedback loops were carefully designed to reflect the Theory of Action and align with the Logic Model to provide a framework to evaluate, reflect and inform course corrections.

Within the feedback loop, Indiana has included evidence collection at each stage to ensure active monitoring and successful implementation. For each evidence stage, Indiana is collecting documentation such as materials, agendas, and evaluations of engagement and is developing tools for collecting data related to implementation fidelity and outcomes. This type of evidence will be collected throughout technical assistance and professional development related to RCA, District Data Review, and EBPs. In addition, rubrics and protocols are being developed to guide coaching, classroom observation and impact of implementation of EBPs. As evidence is collected, it will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of professional development, fidelity of implementation, and impact on student performance. Indiana will continuously monitor and make appropriate adjustments to SSIP to reflect feedback and data.

Please see attached Comprehensive Implementation Manual which includes graphics and descriptions of various steps within the Evaluation Process.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

IDOE leveraged the assistance from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and other federally funded TA Centers throughout SSIP Phase I and II development and initial implementation as follows:

- Participation in bi-weekly to monthly check in calls to: 1) discuss timelines, tools, and resources to support SSIP development and implementation; 2) deliberate outstanding or emerging questions concerning the SSIP; 3) identify areas where support is needed; 4) problem solve specific issues or emerging barriers/challenges; 5) identify opportunities to collaborate and coordinate with other TA providers and/or states.
- Guidance - including modeling - of facilitated activities to secure broad stakeholder engagement and input into the analysis and design of SSIP recommendations. Specifically in the identification and selection of the evidence-based practices prioritized within SSIP strategies.
- Participation in NCSI's Systems Alignment Cross State Learning Collaborative and the subsequent virtual meetings to support Indiana efforts to align school turn around/improvement efforts and the SSIP. Specific support in IDOE's logic model and theory of action.
- Guidance and support in the SiMR revisions and related benchmarks.
- Identification of evidence-based literacy instruction, high-leverage instructional strategies, and leadership school turn around strategies, via a NCSI technical assistance response.
- Identification of existing observation rubrics assessing literacy instruction, via a NCSI technical assistance requests.
- Coordinated discussion between IDOE and the South Carolina Department of Education to facilitate collaboration and coordination concerning the modification of IDC's Success Gap Rubric to meet comparable SSIP approaches.
- Identification of universally available tools and resources to support preservice and in-service professional learning in the identified evidence-based practices (e.g. CEEDAR Early Reading Innovation Configurations and Course Enhancement Modules).

IDOE plans to continue this level of collaboration and coordination with NCSI as follows:

- Consult and problem solve on strategies to advance and monitor fidelity of implementation at both the SEA and LEA levels.
- Development and refinement of the co-drafted literacy instruction observation rubric from the CEEDAR and NCSI Center.
- Training concerning the use of the literacy observation rubric and/or CEEDAR's K-5 Reading Instruction Course Enhancement Module, as needed and requested.
- Continued participation in the Systems Change Cross State Learning Collaborative. As desired, participation in the Literacy Cross State Learning Collaborative.
- Continued guidance concerning data collection toward benchmarks and targets.

Additionally, IDOE intends to utilize the strong infrastructure of Stakeholder engagement and participation established for the Indiana SSIP and identified in Appendix E of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation of the IN-SSIP. That said, the IDOE SSIP Team Leader will develop a schedule for regular check in calls, virtual and/or face to face meetings with the national and Indiana Resource Network TA providers, SDN Case Managers, and Partnering LEAs/Site School SSIP Teams to ensure technical assistance activities are aligned with expectations within the SSIP and being provided as needed to support the plans of the Partnering LEAs. This communication will also allow for opportunities to leverage all available TA resources to provide the type of professional learning and support needed to strengthen teacher and leader practice. These meetings will involve monthly/bi-monthly progress/status reports from each respective TA Center as well as SSIP Partnering LEA and Site Schools. These reports will demonstrate the centers' purposeful alignment and support of the SSIP.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

6/24/2019

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see attached report

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see attached report

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see attached reports

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see attached report

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

Please see attached report

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see attached report

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Nancy Zemaitis

Title: Assistant Director

Email: nzemaitis@doe.in.gov

Phone: 317-232-0568