

IN
Part B

FFY2013
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 Indiana State Education Agency (SEA) is located within the Indiana Department of Education/Division of Student Achievement and Improvement and is the Office of Special Education (IDOE/OSE). The department offers support to IDOE/OSE through ancillary divisions such as Finance and Business Operations, Communications, General Counsel, Government and Public Affairs and School Support Services. Please visit the Indiana website at <http://www.doe.in.gov/> for additional information. IDOE/OSE is strengthening relationships between various divisions through work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (Indicator 17), and the ESEA Waiver and looks forward to further guidance from OSEP on how to take advantage of existing flexibilities in the use of Federal funds, e.g. Special Education and Title funds to improve outcomes for all students.

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

Administration

- Director (1)
- Assistant Director (1)

Due Process Team

- Due Process Coordinator/Attorney (1)
- Complaint Investigator (2)
- Due Process Support Specialist (1)

Fiscal Team

- Part B Grants Supervisor (1)
- Federal Funding Support Specialist (1)
- Medicaid Specialist (1)
- Excess Cost Supervisor (1)
- Excess Cost Support Specialist (1)

Monitoring Team

- Education Specialist (4)
- Data Manager (1)

As a result of a long and productive working relationship with the Parent Training and Information Center, IDOE provides office space for a staff member from 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, (the 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.

GENERAL SUPERVISION COMPONENTS

For the purposes of this document Indiana is using a modified version of the 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 document:

- 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 (Discussed in other sections of the APR introduction)

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. The indicators are categorized as either 'compliance' (the target is 100% or 0%, depending upon the indicator) and 'results' (the target is set by IDOE/OSE by review of trend information and with stakeholder input). Some of the indicators are measured by a statewide number, others include a compilation of local education agency (LEA) information, i.e. what percentage of LEAs meet the target.

The APR is submitted to OSEP each year. The APR reflects the performance of Indiana based upon data collected for each of the indicators and includes the findings that have been made, allowing a year for correction, by the LEA that that did not meet the targets set for the indicators. See "Integrated Monitoring Activities", below for a description of data collection.

The SPP and APR are posted on the IDOE website.

2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The Indiana special education rules are promulgated in the Indiana Administrative Code at 511 IAC 7-32 through 7-48. 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.

As questions arise as local programs implement Article 7, necessary clarification is provided by the Director of Special Education, and this guidance/clarification is posted on the "Learning Connection" which is the IDOE on-line 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 are able to post questions and/or suggestions.

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 in provision of technical assistance to calls and emails from the general public, and are used as the basis of any training that is offered through IDOE/OSE.

3) Integrated Monitoring Activities

Annually, the IDOE/OSE makes a determination whether the LEA meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA, 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 monitoring visits to the LEA, and any other public information made available. 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. The LEA determinations are posted on the public website.

IDOE/OSE conducts various monitoring activities which 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. In part IDOE/OSE conducts monitoring activities through the collection and analysis of data that the LEAs submit throughout the year. This data is compared to the compliance targets as defined in the SPP. There are seventeen specific indicators tied to three overarching themes which are the cornerstones to Part B of IDEA:

- 1) Provision of a free and appropriate 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 for specific indicators found in the SPP. Depending upon how the information is reported in the APR, the team members analyze data either on a state or LEA level. Each LEA is reviewed once every three years on three compliance indicators (B-11, B-12, and B-13). All LEAs are reviewed annually for the other compliance indicators (B-4, B-9, and B-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 the 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 is "clean". In some cases, e.g. 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 of the compliance indicator's information is determined to meet the targets strictly by data, i.e. did the identification of a student's eligibility for special education occur within the state identified timelines. Other compliance decisions take additional factors into account prior to a noncompliance decision. For example, whether an LEA's policies, procedures and practices are the cause of the noncompliance, or whether an Individualized Education Program consists of all elements related to transition from school to adult life.

Letters are sent out to LEAs specifying whether they are in compliance with the applicable indicators or have failed to meet compliance requirements. If an LEA is out of compliance, they must determine the root cause and develop a corrective action plan to address the reason(s) they are noncompliant. The IDOE/OSE education consultant provides assistance through the root cause and corrective action plan activities and maintains regular contact with the staff of the LEA who is responsible for the correction of noncompliance. The regular contact is in the form of telephone calls and emails and consists of discussion about the issues and includes the provision of technical assistance and resources to assist in the correction. The education consultant is responsible to work with the LEA so that each instance of noncompliance is verified to have been corrected within the required timelines, e.g. the transition IEPs contain all required components. (Prong 1) The education consultant is also responsible to review updated data to ensure that any systemic issues that are the cause of noncompliance are addressed. (Prong 2) If it is discovered during the regular contacts that the LEA is not making sufficient progress in correcting noncompliance, more concentrated technical assistance will be provided to ensure the verification of correction during the required timeline. Once the correction has been verified the LEA will be issued a letter documenting that the noncompliance has been corrected. If the LEA is unsuccessful in correcting noncompliance in the required timelines, the IDOE/OSE will impose the appropriate sanctions and/or enforcement.

4) Fiscal Management

IDOE/OSE is responsible for three fiscal management areas:

1) 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 excess 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 which is built upon allowable costs, i.e. 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 an LEA to spend at least the same amount per student as it did in the previous fiscal year on students with disabilities from state and local funds;
- 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 LEA's 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 reports that include an itemization of expenditures and cost.
- IDOE/OSE provide 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 facilitates the OMB Circular A-133 Single Audits and follows up on issue(s) that is identified.

2) Medicaid reimbursement available for health-related services that schools provide to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities: IDOE/OSE has a Medicaid specialist who works with LEAs that make Medicaid claims for covered IEP required services. The LEA is reimbursed at a Medicaid rate for services, i.e. physical therapy, speech therapy, and nursing services, etc. LEAs can also take advantage of the Medicaid Administrative Claiming opportunity. The LEA receives reimbursement for a percent of the local costs for school administrative activities to facilitate healthcare access for ALL students in the district.

3) 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, keenly considering 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:

- (1) A public or private residential program when services in a residential setting are necessary for the student to benefit from special education.
- (2) 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 manage 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. There is a data base maintained by the due process team for dispute resolution data. The information is verified, analyzed and used by personnel to monitor LEAs as well as to complete various federal reports required by OSEP including:

- Child count
- Personnel
- Educational environments
- Student exiting information
- Discipline
- Assessment

- Dispute resolution

The information is also used to complete the annual performance report required by OSEP, and as mentioned previously, used to discover LEA findings of noncompliance, and to make determinations.

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 (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 technical assistance and training, in the correction of deficiencies that are identified through monitoring activities. 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 special conditions on the Part B funds.

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:

- 1) A complaint, which can be filed by anyone, alleges that a school is not complying with:
 - State/federal special education or related 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 and develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, a conclusion, and corrective action, if any.

- 2) Mediation may be used on a voluntary basis to resolve both complaints and disagreements. 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.

- 3) Due process hearings involve an 'independent hearing officer'. The parent, 18 year old student, or the school 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.

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.

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 document '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.

In Indiana, the provision of 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:

- Universal
- Targeted
- 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; information about state and national resources (including the OSEP funded technical assistance centers); links and contact information to relevant local, regional and state resources; written guidance about specific topics; 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. Assistance will be individualized dependent upon the identified issue(s) and could include 1 to 1 consultation between LEA and IDOE/OSE 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 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.

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 document ‘professional development’ is defined as the provision of professional development that improves the acquisition of skills and knowledge to improve the performance of students with disabilities.

In Indiana, the provision of 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 in 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 assistance to LEAs either directly (telephone/email and on-site) and/or through vendors that have been contracted for the purpose of technical assistance and/or professional development. These entities are described below and can be directly accessed by the LEAs in the state:

Indiana IEP Resource Center

Focus: To increase Indiana educators' knowledge and skills that will (a) support the use of Indiana IEP to

develop legally compliant IEPs that follow Article 7 requirements, (b) provide technical assistance and professional development for Indiana educators and staff who are involved in the development of high quality IEPs and (c) support Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the development and use of procedures to ensure compliance and the fidelity of implementation of IEP goals and services that will result in high quality instruction and programming evident by data review and progress monitoring.

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.

Project Success

Focus: Support of teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities. This includes providing critical background information and access to instructional and resource materials developed by NCSC. Project SUCCESS provides monthly professional development sessions to participating teams and on-site technical assistance as needed.

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. IN*SOURCE celebrates the accomplishments of individuals with disabilities and their families and affirms their ongoing commitment to them.

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.

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.

PATINS Project

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. Our mission is to partner with LEAs in securing accessible textbooks and core curriculum materials in specialized formats for qualifying students with print disabilities. The ICAM system is owned, maintained and provided to all Indiana schools by the Office of the Associate Superintendent at the Indiana Department of Education. Access to the system, technical support and professional training are provided through the ICAM and PATINS projects without a fee.

Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center

Focus: To create and enhance professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity to 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.

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

Resource Services at Blumberg Center

Focus: To increase the use of knowledge, procedures, and practices that (a) ensure targeted and high quality instruction and intervention for all students, (b) promote accurate and appropriate identification and programming for students with disabilities, and (c) advance the use of assessment data for the purposes of instructional planning and programming. Multiple resource materials, web modules, and videos are available on the project's website. Training and technical assistance services are available to schools, districts, and special education cooperatives/planning districts on a contracted, fee-based basis.

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

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

In the course of the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) which began in 2005, 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).

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.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(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 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

1) How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A)

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 Director. 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 FFY2012 (SY12-13)."

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 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The State Performance Plan is found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>, under "Federal Reporting", then "Indiana Part B SPP FFY2005-2012 (Revised 02/14/2013)."

OSEP Response

Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		74.00%	87.10%	75.00%	56.71%	59.95%	59.95%	95.00%
Data	69.46%	52.60%	53.20%	58.95%	58.95%	69.72%	65.31%	71.72%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	64.00%	67.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%

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 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	6,252	6252
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	9,023	9,023
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.29%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Not Applicable

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
6,252	9,023	71.72%	64.00%	69.29%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

School Year 2012-2013	
Adjusted 2009-2010 9th Grade Cohort	9660
Dropouts	601
Transfers out	- 1274
Transfers in	+ 637
Diplomas earned 2012-2013	6252
Cohort end of 2012-2013	= 9023
4-year-adjusted cohort graduation rate	$6252 / 9023 = 69.29\%$

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
 OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2011 to FFY 2012 data.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		26.00%	25.00%	24.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.00%	20.00%
Data	30.54%	32.63%	30.01%	26.99%	15.93%	10.76%	10.76%	8.54%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	9.01%	8.51%	8.01%	7.51%	7.01%	6.51%

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 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,767	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	1,063	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	59	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	643	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	22	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21)	Total number of all youth with	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013
--	--------------------------------	----------	----------	----------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	Data*	Target*	Data
643	7,554	8.54%	9.01%	8.51%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	77.50%
Data	81.90%		84.00%	86.80%	98.00%	99.25%	77.00%	77.59%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%

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 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
360	314	239	77.59%	77.50%	76.11%

Explanation of Slippage

Slippage could be attributed to the first year of online academic assessment and issues related to technical difficulties with regard to broadband capabilities at the local LEA level.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's correction to the prepopulated baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2011, which is consistent with the State's FFY 2011 APR.

Required Actions

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. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			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%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			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%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

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 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	82,244	79,434	96.10%	95.00%	96.58%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	82,250	79,736	96.50%	95.00%	96.94%

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/overview.aspx>

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

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed>

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting>

Information located in the Reading and Math Assessment Tabs of the workbook

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in regular assessments at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2015 determination letter, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported, for FFY 2013, to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2014 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2014.

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. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	48.00%	54.00%	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	57.00%	61.00%	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%

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 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	79,434	43,784	52.80%	48.00%	55.12%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	79,736	50,525	60.20%	57.00%	63.37%

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/overview.aspx>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		1.25%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%	1.50%	1.25%	1.00%
Data	3.00%	0.30%	0.59%	1.16%	1.16%	1.45%	2.53%	1.98%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	1.40%	1.30%	1.20%	1.10%	1.00%	0.90%

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 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	360	1.98%	1.40%	1.94%

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 two consecutive years.' Indiana Department of Education sets the sample 'n' size to a minimum of 10 students in a given population. Indiana Department of Education compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions among LEAs in the state.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) notified the LEAs that the data analysis for the reporting year reflected possible non compliance with this indicator and required each LEA to complete a self-assessment of their policies, procedures and practices utilizing the Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey. The LEA self-assessment was returned then reviewed and follow-up telephone interviews and email exchanges were conducted as necessary to ensure the IDOE had complete information. Based on the review of the surveys, supporting documentation and information obtained through the follow up methods, the IDOE determined if the LEA had compliant policies, procedures and practices. If so, the LEA was deemed compliant with this indicator.

If through this process, the IDOE determined that the LEA had policies and procedures that were not sufficient to make a determination of compliance, practices were then reviewed using a file review rubric. The IDOE conducted a file review, including review of the Individualized Education Plan and applicable supporting documentation. IDOE selected the files based upon a ten percent random sample (no less than five, no more than 10) of case files of students with disabilities that were suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. If practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings 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.

The LEAs with findings of non compliance were informed that the non compliance 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 non compliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, and,
- Review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with non compliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the 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 non compliance.

 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 2012

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

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of non compliance were informed that the non compliance 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 development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with non compliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the 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 non compliance.

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

The LEAs with findings of non compliance were informed that the non compliance 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 non compliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of non compliance.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

--

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: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					1.50%	2.31%	2.00%	1.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
14	9	360	1.70%	0%	2.50%

Explanation of Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target of 0.00 % for the reporting year and had slippage. In the reporting year, when an LEA's data exceeded the risk ratio, Indiana Department of Education instituted a more rigorous review of policies, procedures and practices than in previous years. The Policy and Procedure Survey as well as File Review Rubrics were almost completely revised, and required LEAs to provide more explanation and documentation as compared to previous years. Due to the higher expectations slippage occurred.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Indiana Department of Education's (IDOE) definition identifies Significant Discrepancy of racial and ethnic

groups (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, and two or more races) as a risk ratio for a given racial/ethnic group that is greater than 2.0 for two consecutive years. IDOE sets the sample “n” size to 10 or more students with disabilities in any of the racial/ethnic groups suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Indiana notified the LEAs that the data analysis for the reporting year reflected possible non compliance with this indicator and required each LEA to complete a self-assessment of their policies, procedures and practices utilizing the Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey. The LEA self-assessment was returned then reviewed and follow-up telephone interviews and email exchanges were conducted as necessary to ensure Indiana had complete information. Based on the review of the surveys, supporting documentation and information obtained through the follow up methods, Indiana determined if the LEA had compliant policies, procedures and practices. If so, the LEA was deemed compliant with this indicator.

If through this process, Indiana determined that the LEA had policies and procedures that were not sufficient to make a determination of compliance, practices were then reviewed using a file review rubric. Indiana conducted a file review, including review of the Individualized Education Plan and applicable supporting documentation. Indiana selected the files based upon a ten percent random sample (no less than five, no more than 10) of case files of students with disabilities that were suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. If practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings 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).

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.

The LEAs with findings of non compliance were informed that the non compliance 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 non compliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA, and,
- Review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the

LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with non compliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the 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 non compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. 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 IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until noncompliance was corrected. 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. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s).

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

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. The LEAs worked with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, IDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance. 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 provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2013 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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education 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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2008	Target ≥		60.37%	60.38%	60.39%	60.40%	60.41%	60.42%	60.43%
		Data	59.54%	63.19%	62.81%	63.77%	64.89%	67.86%	69.28%	68.81%
B	2008	Target ≤		15.30%	15.29%	15.28%	15.27%	15.26%	15.25%	15.24%
		Data	14.33%	13.14%	13.06%	12.94%	12.51%	12.60%	12.03%	10.90%
C	2008	Target ≤		1.22%	1.21%	1.20%	1.19%	1.18%	1.17%	1.16%
		Data	1.99%	2.20%	2.50%	2.42%	2.46%	2.25%	2.26%	2.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%
Target B ≤	12.00%	11.50%	11.00%	10.50%	10.00%	9.50%
Target C ≤	2.16%	2.15%	2.14%	2.13%	2.12%	2.11%

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 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	151,816	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	106,282	null

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,166	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,505	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	697	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	952	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	106,282	151,816	68.81%	67.00%	70.01%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,166	151,816	10.90%	12.00%	10.65%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,154	151,816	2.19%	2.16%	2.08%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) attributes its overall progress in Indicator 5 to an increased focus in the state on appropriate Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) placements. The IDOE began making on site visits to the lowest performing LEAs on Indicator 5 in FFY09. The IDOE continues monitoring LRE data in order to ensure improvement from year to year. From the inception of the on site LRE data monitoring program in FFY09, the IDOE has noted that the amount of time students spend in the general education setting has continued to rise. As a result of this Focused Monitoring, some LEAs were issued findings of non compliance with regard to this Indicator. Data regarding the FFY2012 findings and progress toward correction are included in the attached document.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.
OSEP accepts the State's change in baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2008 data.

Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								38.71%
		Data							38.70%	40.34%
B	2011	Target ≤								35.19%
		Data							35.20%	33.32%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	39.50%	40.00%	40.50%	41.00%	41.50%	42.00%
Target B ≤	33.10%	33.00%	32.90%	32.80%	32.70%	32.60%

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 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,014	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	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	7,330	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	5,678	null

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	284	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	6	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,330	18,014	40.34%	39.50%	40.69%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,968	18,014	33.32%	33.10%	33.13%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2010	Target ≥					52.50%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%
		Data				52.00%	66.10%	64.20%	78.30%	73.70%
A2	2010	Target ≥					41.00%	41.50%	42.00%	42.50%
		Data				40.70%	36.10%	20.40%	20.10%	25.80%
B1	2010	Target ≥					65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%
		Data				65.10%	65.00%	72.60%	77.70%	81.30%
B2	2010	Target ≥					48.00%	48.50%	49.00%	49.50%
		Data				47.80%	32.40%	15.40%	13.30%	16.00%
C1	2010	Target ≥					77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%
		Data				76.70%	63.10%	74.50%	80.00%	83.20%
C2	2010	Target ≥					64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%
		Data				64.40%	31.50%	16.90%	13.90%	17.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%
Target A2 ≥	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
Target B1 ≥	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%	83.00%
Target B2 ≥	15.00%	15.50%	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%	17.50%
Target C1 ≥	83.00%	83.50%	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%
Target C2 ≥	16.50%	17.00%	17.50%	18.00%	18.50%	19.00%

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 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	2,970
--	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	18
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	759
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,604
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	421
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	168

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,025	2,802	73.70%	72.00%	72.27%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	589	2,970	25.80%	22.00%	19.83%

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Even though Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage in A2, there are still a majority (99.4%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in the acquisition and use of positive social-emotional skills. IDOE is working to align the preschool Foundations (standards) with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of preschool standards with K-12 standards will enable teachers to help preschool students reach functioning within age expectations by age of exit.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	625
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,027
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	248
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	57

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,275	2,913	81.30%	80.50%	78.10%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	305	2,970	16.00%	15.00%	10.27%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Even though Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage in B1, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. IDOE is working to align the preschool Foundations (standards) with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of preschool standards with K-12 standards will enable teachers to help preschool students reach functioning within age expectations by age of exit.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Even though Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage in B2, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. IDOE is working to align the preschool Foundations (standards) with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of preschool standards with K-12 standards will enable teachers to help preschool students reach functioning within age expectations by age of exit.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	16
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	531
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,083
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	282
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	58

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,365	2,912	83.20%	83.00%	81.22%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	340	2,970	17.40%	16.50%	11.45%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Even though Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage in C1, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in the acquisition and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. IDOE is working to align the preschool Foundations (standards) with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of preschool

standards with K-12 standards will enable teachers to help preschool students reach functioning within age expectations by age of exit.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Even though Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage in C2, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in the acquisition and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. IDOE is working to align the preschool Foundations (standards) with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of preschool standards with K-12 standards will enable teachers to help preschool students reach functioning within age expectations by age of exit.

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.

Data is derived from 1/3 of the state for this Indicator during each FFY. Data will vary greatly from year to year due to differences in LEAs being monitored.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Indiana Department of Education utilizes the ISTAR-KR assessment tool which utilizes a method for capturing the statistical construct of achievement with peers. Based on a student’s birth data, a score that is equal to or above this expected score would be considered evidence of achievement at a level that is “comparable to same age peers”. The ISTAR-KR represents a system based on rigorous high standards for student achievement.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has included the “Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY13”.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		88.20%	88.40%	88.60%	42.20%	42.40%	42.60%	42.80%
Data		93.60%	80.40%	90.10%	42.20%	69.60%	70.70%	71.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%

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 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
9,718	10,484	71.10%	69.00%	92.69%

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.

Indiana does not complete a sampling plan but includes all parents of students with disabilities throughout the state for a total of 172,217 packets distributed. The data is combined with all surveys to determine an overall parent rating in regards to the school's efforts to partner with parents. The data is disaggregated on four levels (PreK, Elementary School, Middle School, and High School).

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

In order to obtain an acceptable response rate and a representative sample of respondents, the vendor enlisted support from the Center for Exceptional Learners (CEL), Parent Information Resource Centers (PIRCs), Parent Resource Centers (PRCs), Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), About Special Kids (ASK), and any other identified advocacy organizations that were willing to support the Indicator 8 Parent Survey completion. To further support an improved response rate, the vendor provided multiple response mechanisms for respondents [1]. Parents were able to respond to a web-based survey or via a paper survey. Respondents were also provided with contact information at IDOE and the vendor for any follow-up questions or additional support in completing the survey.

A review of the response data shows a correlation between the survey respondent demographics and the state demographics for students who are in special education. A review of the results by disability shows a slightly higher response rate than the state percentage for 'intellectual disability', 'developmental delay' and 'multiple disabilities' while there was a slightly lower response rate than the state percentage for 'other health impairment' and 'specific learning disability'. These are still considered within a range that accurately represents the demographics of the state.

A review of the results by ethnicity shows a correlation between survey respondent demographics and state demographics for students who are in special education.

[1] Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Submitted collection tool: [Revised Parent Survey](#)

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP accepts the State's correction to the prepopulated baseline from FFY 2005 to FFY 2009, which is consistent with the State's FFY 2009 APR.

Required Actions

--

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	360	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) defines disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) of racial and ethnic groups in special education & related services as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 in special education and related services, for two consecutive years. IDOE has a required minimum “n” size of 30 students with a disability in a given population.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.41%	4.15%	3.85%	4.05%	0%	3.18%	3.18%	1.13%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

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 in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
25	7	360	1.13%	0%	1.94%

Explanation of Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target of 0.00 % for the reporting year and had slippage. In the reporting year, when an LEAs data exceeded the risk ratio, Indiana Department of Education instituted a more rigorous review of policies, procedures and practices than in previous years. The Policy and Procedure Survey as well as File Review Rubrics were almost completely revised, and required LEAs to provide more explanation and documentation as compared to previous years. Due to the higher expectations slippage occurred.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Indiana Department of Education's definition is “percent of districts with 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 (Mental Disability, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Speech and Language Impairment,

Other Health Impairment, and Autism) that is the result of inappropriate identification”. IDOE has a required minimum “n” size of 30 students with a disability in a given population. IDOE includes the total number of LEAs in the state for the denominator.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP. 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 IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until noncompliance was corrected. 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. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s).

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

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. The LEAs worked with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, IDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance. 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

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2013 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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	78.00%	85.90%	87.70%	92.30%	98.00%	98.50%	97.90%	97.85%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
12,929	12,779	97.85%	100%	98.84%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	150
---	-----

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 are 146 students. Timelines were missed for a variety of reasons identified as follows: staff shortages, volume of referrals, scheduling conflicts, timeline errors, inadequate tracking, improper documentation and staff errors. The range and number of days missed for each evaluation is identified in the table below.

The Number and Range of Days of Initial Evaluations Outside Required Timeline	
a. 1-5 Instructional Days	66
b. 6-10 Instructional Days	24
c. 11-15 Instructional Days	16
d. 16 + Instructional Days	44

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.

In FFY 2013 (SY 13-14) 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 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	15	3	3

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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) 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the 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.

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

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. 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 for FFY2012 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.

FFY 2012 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 FFY 2013. For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) 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 will continue to receive consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and participate in required corrective action as identified above.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each LEA with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.80%	93.40%	91.70%	92.74%	97.80%	93.96%	98.93%	99.04%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,160
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	189
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	822
d. Number 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.	44
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	93

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	822	834	99.04%	100%	98.56%

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	12
--	----

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. 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 that there were 12 eligible children referred from Part C who did not receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) by the age of three in Indiana. The data indicates that all 12 children did not receive a FAPE due to failure on the part of the LEA. The range of days beyond the third birthday is from 1 day to 270 days. The reasons include staff error, improper documentation, and inadequate tracking.

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.

In FFY 2013 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, 2014, and ranged from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 in order to encompass the entire reporting year.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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	1	0	1

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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) 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 root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the 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.

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

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. 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 for FFY2012 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, although late, each child that was eligible had an IEP developed and services were implemented. 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.

FFY 2012 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 FFY 2013. For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) 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 will continue to receive consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and participate in required corrective action as identified above.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and the LEA with the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					80.22%	84.05%	73.32%	79.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
402	496	79.00%	100%	81.05%

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 Indiana state rule 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’ transitional IEPs. The review was conducted to ensure that IDOE meets the reporting requirements and to inform 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 students or did not have large populations of students with disabilities. A report of the review is then provided to IDOE.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
60	59	1	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issued 60 Indicator 13 findings that were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist. 59 of those LEAs demonstrated correction by achieving 100% compliance on current IEPs using the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist. IDOE verified the correction of all non compliance in 59 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 phone calls and e-mails 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 at the LEA location or through regional trainings. LEA administrative and teaching personnel attended those opportunities.

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

The IDOE verified correction to all individual cases of non compliance by using Indiana's 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 in the LEA.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 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 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						34.80%	35.30%	35.80%
		Data					34.30%	32.50%	33.90%	35.90%
B	2009	Target ≥						49.10%	49.60%	51.10%
		Data					49.10%	56.40%	62.10%	63.80%
C	2009	Target ≥						86.60%	87.10%	87.60%
		Data					86.10%	76.10%	77.90%	78.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	36.30%	36.80%	37.30%	37.80%	38.30%	38.80%
Target B ≥	63.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%
Target C ≥	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	86.20%

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 2013 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	1,867
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	620
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	505
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)	172
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).	187

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	620	1,867	35.90%	36.30%	33.21%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,125	1,867	63.80%	63.50%	60.26%
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)	1,484	1,867	78.00%	77.50%	79.49%

Explanation of A Slippage

The target for 14A was not met and showed slippage. With the low number of respondents, 18.6 %, it is hard to capture an accurate picture of Indiana students with disabilities after they exit from high school. This is a decrease in the percentage of respondents from FFY2012. In FFY2013, the survey administrator had an increased number of refusals and an increased inability to reach the respondent youth. Indiana is continually working on transition as well as transition goals to increase the number of students enrolled in higher education as well as examining our process for completion of the Post-Graduate survey. Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) will continue to leverage the use parent advocacy groups to help notify parents of respondent youth of the importance of gathering all usable information from the post-graduate survey.

Explanation of B Slippage

The target for 14B was not met and showed slippage. With the low number of respondents, 18.6 %, it is hard to capture an accurate picture of Indiana students with disabilities after they exit from high school. This is a decrease in the percentage of respondents from FFY2012. In FFY2013, the survey administrator had an increased number of refusals and an increased inability to reach the respondent youth. Indiana is continually working on transition as well as transition goals to increase the number of students enrolled in higher education as well as examining our process for completion of the Post-Graduate survey. Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) will continue to leverage the use parent advocacy groups to help notify parents of respondent youth of the importance of gathering all usable information from the post-graduate survey.

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

On April 27, 2015, the State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator, to be implemented in collecting data beginning with its FFY 2014 data. An evaluation of that revised sampling plan indicated that it could yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State may proceed in collecting data using this revised sampling plan.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥			30.60%	30.80%	31.00%	31.20%	31.40%	31.60%
Data	30.20%	94.00%	66.00%	71.00%	66.00%	83.33%	83.02%	73.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%

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
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	37	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	46	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
37	46	73.33%	72.50%	80.43%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		52.40%	52.60%	52.80%	53.00%	53.00%	53.40%	53.64%
Data	52.00%	82.00%	55.00%	69.20%	69.40%	59.38%	76.47%	76.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	74.50%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%

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
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	39	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	53	null

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
3	39	53	76.19%	74.50%	79.25%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	29.00%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	29.00%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%	31.00%

Description of Measure

Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment will be used as the measurement tool for this Indicator. The purpose of the Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD-3) assessment is to measure foundational reading standards through grade three. IREAD-3 is a summative assessment that was developed in accordance with House Enrolled Act 1367 (also known as Public Law 109 in 2010) which "requires the evaluation of reading skills for students who are in grade three beginning in the Spring of 2012 to ensure that all students can read proficiently before moving on to grade four." The baseline target was set using an average of the proficiency trend data for students in the purposeful sample group over the three years that this assessment has been given. Targets were then set to reflect a measureable overall improvement of 2% by 2018. It is the goal of the SSIP Stakeholder Team and IDOE to evaluate student growth and to consider exploring additional tools for measuring progress. In addition, a future goal will be to further explore new assessments and consider local assessments and utilize these for the triangulation of student measures of growth. With this goal in mind, it is likely that there will be changes to measures used, targets and baselines as Indiana moves along in the process of the SSIP. In addition to the use of these measures for identifying student growth, they will also be utilized as a part of the Response to Instruction (RTI)/Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) implementation that will be one of the strategies in the schools receiving support for the SSIP.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 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.

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.

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 Measureable 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.

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.

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:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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."

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

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:

Indiana will increase reading proficiency achievement on Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment by .5% each year for 3rd grade male students eligible for free/reduced lunch, identified as having specific learning disabilities.

Description

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.

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 was 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.

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.

Focus groups were identified using the purposeful sample group schools used in the data analysis process. A Title 1 education specialist and special education specialist partnered with the local Outreach coordinator to visit those schools to gather qualitative data in order to determine the root cause for the low performance of third grade male students with SLD receiving free/reduced lunch in these schools. In addition to possible reasons for poor student outcomes, possible solutions were also solicited. For this reason, focus group members became a quasi-stakeholder group for the purpose of identifying coherent improvement strategies. Special education teachers, general education teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals and Title 1 instructional coaches were interviewed individually, collectively, and through surveys to gather as much information as possible to get to the root cause as to why these students are not reaching proficiency rates similar to their general education peers.

After visiting eight schools in the purposeful sample group, data from the interviews and observations were analyzed for common themes. Three broad areas of root cause were identified as leading to poor performance for these students: 1) lack of quality instruction 2) lack of early literacy instruction and 2) lack of high expectations. After reviewing the areas of root cause current infrastructures that may be leveraged to address these areas were reviewed by the SSIP Leadership Team. Afterwards, the SSIP stakeholder group was presented with the information regarding the root cause data and possible coherent improvement strategies identified by the internal stakeholder group and core leadership team. At this meeting, an "idea

walk” activity was completed where stakeholders were encouraged to share additional ideas for each area of root cause and consider how current infrastructure strengths and weaknesses may impact these coherent improvement activities.

Indiana was encouraged by external consultants to consider, during Phase II of the SSIP, the establishment of a ‘pilot’ school. The SSIP stakeholder group considered the pros and cons of such an experiment and determined that the information obtained through a pilot school would be informative in the development of the implementation plan and evaluation component. It was decided that Indiana will create a pilot of at least one school from an LEA that meets the selection criteria identified for the initial phase of implementation (SSIP Phase III). The pilot school will allow for an opportunity to determine infrastructure development needs while developing the implementation plan. A pilot will also provide a vehicle for trying specific coherent improvement activities before full implementation.

Three potential areas of root cause that are contributing to poor student performance have been identified, however, it will be essential to gather a more comprehensive root cause analysis from the school(s) in the pilot group (including parent and student perspectives) in order to confirm appropriate coherent improvement activities and identify infrastructure needs related to the pilot school(s). As a part of the initial implementation process, the school(s) participating in the pilot will complete an internal root cause analysis with collaboration from the IDOE team. The analysis will incorporate IEP file reviews to determine the individual needs of the students with specific learning disabilities in the pilot schools. In addition to this there will also be an assessment of teacher training needs related to reading instruction needs conducted. Further development related to this this assessment will occur in Phase II.

As mentioned earlier, the external stakeholder group identified the three ‘Cs’ as capacity, cohesion, and communication. The qualitative analysis resulting in the first root cause, quality instruction, involves all three. It was determined through the qualitative analysis process that teachers of reading instruction are not adequately prepared to teach reading to students with specific learning disabilities within the core 90 minute reading block (capacity). There were also reports of confusion regarding who is responsible for the actual teaching of reading skills. Teachers were not clear if core reading instruction should be taught in the classroom or if it was the responsibility of the special education teacher to pull the student out of class for a period of time and teach the skills (communication and cohesion).

Evidence based coherent improvement activities identified by IDOE to address this root cause are based on professional development using Indiana’s Learning Connection Community (Indiana Literacy Liaisons...Read On, Indiana!). The community provides a series of targeted training webinars related to small group instruction within the 90 minute reading block, K-6 Reading Modules (based on Evidenced Based Practices for teaching reading), and Tools to support Indiana’s Academic Standards 2014. Coupled with this will be advanced training on the relationship between Response to Instruction (RTI)/Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and providing quality instruction to students within the general education setting. IDOE is in the process of collaborating with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center and The Equity Project to provide comprehensive guidance materials and training regarding evidence based practices around RTI/MTSS. The inclusion of these resources as a coherent improvement activity for Indiana’s SIMR sets the stage for continuity within initiatives among IDOE.

A lack of pre-literacy skills coming into school and a means to target and address these prior to starting kindergarten was identified as another area of root cause for poor student performance. According to the focus groups, this area is the most challenging because teachers felt they had little control over education prior to students beginning kindergarten. When students began school without pre-literacy skills and were later identified with specific learning disabilities, it was communicated that these students continued to lag further and further behind their peers. Currently, Indiana does not have comprehensive universal Pre-K. However, beginning in the fall of 2016, in five Indiana counties, some families may be eligible for “On My Way Pre-K” grants if they meet household income requirements (being 127% of the federal poverty level). Public schools can become qualified as “On My Way Pre-K” eligible programs through Paths to Quality accreditation and may also use Title 1 funding to complement or extend this programming. The stakeholders identified that the coherent improvement strategy used to address this root cause would be to assist schools in developing programming opportunities for Pre-K students that address pre-literacy instruction. In addition, the inclusion of these students into an RTI/MTSS model of intervention would allow earlier opportunities for

intervention for those students who may have academic or behavioral challenges in need of more intense intervention. Indiana will also work with various family groups and organizations to identify ways education can begin, and be supported, at home.

The final area of root cause was identified to be a generalized philosophical belief of building leaders and school staff within local education agencies that there are (or should be) lower expectations for students with specific learning disabilities. Research supports that high expectations lead to better results for students. Those students who experience educationally low expectations begin to believe and fulfill the expectations set forth for them. Conversely, those students that have been provided with high expectations, and have been given the supports to meet those expectations, achieve at higher rates. As a means to address this area of root cause, IDOE will collaborate with the Division of Outreach to provide targeted professional development emphasizing the use of "Turnaround Principles". The Outreach team provides regular leadership series for building leaders that address various turnaround principles. In addition to these, IDOE will collaborate with Outreach and family groups/organizations to coordinate some targeted professional development for schools related to increasing expectations for students with disabilities.

The coherent improvement strategies include evidence based practices that have been successfully utilized in other school based settings. The turnaround principles mentioned above are aligned to the US Department of Education Turnaround Principles and include: 1) school leadership, 2) school culture and climate, 3) instruction, 4) assessment and intervention, 5) staffing practices, 6) use of data, 7) use of time and 8) family and community engagement. For example, one of the root causes has been identified as quality instruction, which is included under assessment and intervention (principle 4). The principle is 'ensure that teachers have the foundational documents and instructional materials needed to teach to the rigorous college and career ready state standards'. There are four corresponding indicators, required sources of evidence, and a scoring continuum from 'ineffective to highly effective' which will be used as part of the evaluation plan.

The selection of these coherent improvement strategies were made based on the guidance found on the OSEP website, "Stage One of the Implementation Framework: Exploration Stage". It is important to clarify that while Indiana as an SEA has identified broad areas of focus for coherent improvement activities, it is the plan to continually provide support based on local needs and move from the "thirty thousand foot" to the "on the ground" perspective. Once implementation begins during Phase II and Phase III, it is the expectation that there will continue to be an "exploration stage" as each new school/LEA is added to the implementation and the scope of the work towards the SSIP is scaled up.

As Indiana considered the various components of the implementation framework beginning with identifying needs and options related to the selected coherent improvement strategies, it was found that IDOE has initiatives in place (or currently in development) that align themselves with the identified strategies. It is a goal in Phase II to have a pilot district/school and use the experience of the pilot school to determine needs that may not have been identified during Phase I of the SSIP. It is important to recognize that there is still more work to be done. Needs assessments with regards to specific skills of teachers within the schools that receive implementation may have varying skill needs compared to those is the focus groups during the data collection process. The pilot may provide additional areas of root cause that have not yet been explored or considered. This could have an impact on coherent improvement activities as the process moves forward. Additionally, in order to create readiness for implementation within the pilot schools and the initial implementation schools a year later, Indiana has more deliberate planning that needs to occur. Usable interventions that are already available (or are in the process of development) have been identified, and team structures within IDOE are accessible to support implementation of these interventions. The next steps for creating readiness, according to the OSEP guidance, are to identify LEA/school team structures and develop communication plans. This will occur during the first months of Phase II. A planning meeting has been set for April 13, 2015 with the core team of special education, Title 1, and Outreach IDOE staff to begin the process of identifying the possible pilot district and school for the 2015-16 school year. Additional meetings will be held to identify the marketing plan on how to approach the potential pilot district/school(s) and the participation requirements. Though Indiana has started to build a strong cornerstone for the SSIP through the Phase I work, it is recognized that there is still work that needs to be done to address the guidance in the Exploration Stage of the Implementation Framework in order to build a strong foundation for change and outcomes for the targeted students.

The emphasis on scaling up and impacting the state as a whole is a long-term goal of IDOE to achieve the State Identified Measurable Result. For this reason, an interdependent relationship between all systems at every education level is essential in addressing the needs of these students. It is the responsibility of IDOE to provide technical assistance, governance, fiscal support, and the tools LEAs need for success. LEAs need to understand and translate these resources and expectations with fidelity to their building leaders and teachers who will influence the outcomes and changes identified in the SIMR.

Quality systemic change takes time. IDOE is using a formula for selecting focus schools for the initial implementation. It is the expectation that each year this formula would allow for an increase in number of schools participating in implementation and further scaling up. Since schools receive “D” or focus status based on a specified formula within the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, changes to the waiver could have an impact on the formula used for selection of future participants. Initially, the sample size and students being targeted for these interventions will be relatively small. However, as interventions are determined to be successful, outcomes are achieved, and the process is streamlined, the opportunity to add LEAs/schools as part of the “scale up” will be more easily achieved. Eventually, data would be available to support “Best Practice” models of success for the LEAs and schools that have participated in the initiative. These interventions then will be applied at a larger scale using the lessons learned on capacity building from the initial targeted schools and from first-hand experience in increasing student outcomes.

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.

[Theory of Action- Indiana](#) Theory of Action- Indiana

Illustration



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

The graphic illustration for IDOE's SSIP Theory of Action (TOA) displays three areas of concentration with “If, Then” statements for each area. These areas correlate with the identified areas of root cause and corresponding coherent improvement activities that will lead to improved outcomes for students being targeted for improved results within the SIMR. Though OSEP is the impetus of the SSIP, Indiana has the IDOE reflected in the TOA as the first area of action to implement the activities necessary to set the State for results driven outcomes. Indiana has already set the stage through collaboration with various IDOE offices, the establishment of various stakeholder groups, an infrastructure analysis, and the identification of coherent improvement strategies. The LEA is the next level in the TOA. Utilizing the resources at a state level, the LEA will set the expectations for the building leaders and teachers and support them to obtain results. The building leader is the next driving force needed to provide the supports for the teacher. With this reinforcement, teachers will be able to effectively teach and have higher expectations for the students. It is the goal of the SSIP that with foundational support and an interdependent and supportive relationship that addresses each level within the education system, the student will realize measurable improvement that is evident and sustainable.

The Theory of Action was developed by the core leadership team based on OSEP guidance and was shared with the stakeholders who provided input and approval 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.

Indiana would like to thank the staff from the federally funded technical assistance center that have spent the past year and a half assisting the Indiana office of special education staff in ensuring the process was both deliberate and focused and that IDOE followed the recommended guidance found on the OSEP website in regard to phase I of the SSIP.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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, OSE

Email: nzemaitis@doe.in.gov

Phone: 317-232-0568