Executive Summary:
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<th>File Name</th>
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<th>Uploaded Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No APR attachments found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

370

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

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/](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). The Every Student Succeeds Act has recently been passed and the IDOE/OSE looks forward to ongoing involvement in the implementation of the Act to ensure excellence and equity for students with disabilities in Indiana.

The IDOE/OSE has seventeen 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 (3)
- Due Process Support Specialist (1)

**Fiscal Team**

- Part B Grants Supervisor (1)
As a result of a long and productive working relationship with the Parent Training and Information Center, IDOE is one of a few states, if not the only state, that provides office space for a staff member from IN*SOURCE, which helps to facilitate a close working relationship between the two entities. The IN*SOURCE staff member is an integral part of IDOE/OSE, attending IDOE/OSE staff meetings and is asked to speak to family members who call in with questions.

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

The IDOE/OSE ‘system of general supervision’ is a cohesive, coordinated set of the activities described below. It is important to note that though personnel have an assigned ‘area of responsibility,’ work is not done in isolation. Staff work closely with one another as each is dependent upon the others for updates, sharing of information, and communication of issues that impact the entire office. Staff also work in partnership with other offices and divisions within the department including, but not limited to Federal Title Grant Programs, English Learning and Migrant Education, Early Learning, ELEarning, Educator Effectiveness, School Improvement Grants, School Choice, Family and Community Engagement, Finance, College and Career Ready and Assessment. Staff also works closely with other state agencies that provide and fund services for students with disabilities, e.g. Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning, Vocational Rehabilitation Services and the Division of Mental Health.

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. Each indicator is categorized as either ‘compliance’ (the target is 100% or 0%, depending upon the indicator) or ‘results’ (the target is set by IDOE/OSE based on trend...
analysis and stakeholder input). Some are measured by a statewide number, others include a compilation of local education agency (LEA) information, i.e. the percentage of LEAs that meet the target.

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

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

2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

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

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

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

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

3) Integrated Monitoring Activities

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

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

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

IDOE/OSE conducts various monitoring activities that focus on improving educational results and functional
outcomes for all children with disabilities, and ensuring that LEAs and other educational programs meet the
program requirements under Part B of the IDEA. IDOE/OSE conducts monitoring activities through the
collection and analysis of data that the LEAs submit throughout the year. These data are compared to the
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 appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;

2) The IDOE/OSE exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of
resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services; and

3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to
the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification of the student with a disability.

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

Letters are sent to LEAs specifying whether they are in compliance with the applicable indicators or failed to
meet compliance requirements. If an LEA is out of compliance, it must determine the root cause and
develop a corrective action plan to address the reason(s) it is noncompliant. The designated IDOE/OSE
education specialist provides assistance through the root cause identification and corrective action plan
development then maintains regular contact with the LEA staff responsible for correction of the identified
noncompliance. This regular contact is in the form of telephone calls, face to face visits as well as emails
consisting of discussion about the issues, provision of technical assistance and identification of resources
to assist with correction.

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

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 costs of providing special education and related services to students who are eligible for special education services. These funds are to supplement state, local and other federal funds. The IDOE/OSE team members provide intensive technical assistance to LEA personnel to ensure the funds are utilized and reported appropriately.

The funds are distributed through an application process which includes:

- An LEA budget that is built upon allowable costs, e.g., personnel/benefits, equipment, purchased services, materials, etc.;
- Identification of a proportionate share of Part B funds that will be spent on equitable services for parentally-placed private school children with disabilities;
- Maintenance of Effort, which requires 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 provides assistance to LEAs regarding maintenance of effort, clarifying that expenses should be consistent year to year, logically be connected to special education, and that expenses be tracked for audit purposes.

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

- IDOE/OSE reviews the OMB Circular A-133 Single Audits and follows up on any issues that are 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 claim Medicaid reimbursement for covered IEP-required services (e.g., physical therapy, speech therapy, nursing services, etc). The LEA is reimbursed at the Medicaid-allowable rate for these services, thereby recovering available federal funds pursuant to federal and state Medicaid and Education laws and rules. LEAs can also take advantage of Indiana’s Medicaid Administrative Claiming opportunity, in which the participating LEA recovers a portion of its state and local costs for staff 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, including consideration of least restrictive environment and includes detailed information about any private vendor and the costs of the service(s). The funding may pay for services that include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

5) Data on Processes and Results

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

- 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 placing special conditions on the use of 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 then develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, conclusions, and corrective action, if any.

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

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

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

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

- Universal
- Targeted
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**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 LEA technical assistance and professional development go hand in hand. Dependent upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development. For ease of reading, the levels of assistance will be outlined as the ‘Technical Assistance System’, and the provision of technical assistance/professional development will be addressed in the “Professional Development System” description portion of the introduction.

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

- Universal
- Targeted
The universal level is available to all LEAs and includes resources through: discussion with or training by the IDOE/OSE staff members; the IDOE website including topic specific communities of learning; the IDOE Learning Connection; information about state and national resources (including the OSEP funded technical assistance centers); links and contact information to relevant local, regional and state resources; written guidance about specific topics; webinars, and, question and answer documents.

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

The intensive level of assistance has a focus on those LEAs that have identified issues that most likely are systemic and require rigorous LEA work and focused assistance by the IDOE/OSE. 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 training and technical activities leading to the acquisition of skills and knowledge to improve the performance of students with disabilities. Depending upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development.

IDOE/OSE provides assistance to LEAs either directly (telephone/email and on-site) On-line resources, and/or through vendors that have been contracted for the purpose of technical assistance and/or professional development (http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indiana-resource-network). These entities are described below and can be directly accessed by the LEAs in the state:

### Indiana IEP Resource Center

Focus: To increase 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, (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 and (d) provide tiered level of support for statewide efforts to improve outcomes related to Least Restrictive Environment (Indicator 5).
PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center (Grant ended 9/2015)
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. Though this grant has ended, the website and online resources are available.

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 that have been tailored to Indiana’s standards. 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
Focus: The PATINS Project is a state-wide technical assistance network that provides accessible technology for assisting LEAs in the utilization and creation of accessible learning environments and instructional materials. As a sole source provider for the Indiana Department of Administration and the Indiana Department of Education, the PATINS Project provides a complete state NIMAS delivery process, inclusive of assistive and accessible technologies, designed to support the Indiana Department of Education and LEAs in addressing the statutory and final regulatory requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM)
Focus: The Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM) is a PATINS Project managed web-based system designed to provide supports to Indiana LEAs in meeting the NIMAS regulations of the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004. The mission is to partner with LEAs in securing accessible textbooks and core curriculum materials in specialized formats for qualifying students with print disabilities. Access to the system, technical support and professional training are provided through the ICAM and PATINS projects without a fee.

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

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

**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-for-services 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.

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

**The Indiana Resource Center for Autism**
Focus: The Indiana Resource Center for Autism (IRCA) staff are actively engaged in work that leads to improved outcomes for individuals on the autism spectrum and related disorders, and their families by providing professionals, family members, and individuals with ASD with the knowledge and skills to support children and adults in typical early intervention, school, community, work, postsecondary and home settings.
The work of IRCA covers a wide range of activities focused on building local capacity via information development and dissemination, customized trainings, statewide conferences, individual consultations, coaching, and research.

Through our social media (Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest), numerous list serves, website and free newsletter, IRCA provides access to a wealth of free and practical tools that can be easily replicated and used across a variety of settings. As Indiana’s state legislated autism center, IRCA is committed to responding with accurate and timely information that addresses the needs of individuals across the autism spectrum and across the lifespan.

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

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

1) How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 FFY2013 (SY13-14).”

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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.


See http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting for federally reported 618 data.
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### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response


### Required Actions


**Indicator 1: Graduation**

**Historical Data and Targets**

**Baseline Data:** 2012

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>56.71%</td>
<td>59.95%</td>
<td>59.95%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>69.46%</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
<td>53.20%</td>
<td>58.95%</td>
<td>58.95%</td>
<td>69.72%</td>
<td>65.31%</td>
<td>71.72%</td>
<td>69.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY2014</th>
<th>FFY2015</th>
<th>FFY2016</th>
<th>FFY2017</th>
<th>FFY2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions
Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</td>
<td>8,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma</th>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>8,847</td>
<td>69.29%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>73.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status  Slippage

- Met Target
- No Slippage

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 2013-2014

Adjusted 2010-2011 9th Grade Cohort 9898

Dropouts 456

Transfers out - 1490

Transfers in + 415

Diplomas earned 2013-2014 6495
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort end of 2013-2014</td>
<td>8847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year-adjusted cohort graduation rate</td>
<td>6495 / 8847 = 73.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Required Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 2: Drop Out
Historical Data and Targets

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≤ 26.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>30.54%</td>
<td>32.63%</td>
<td>30.01%</td>
<td>26.99%</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>10.76%</td>
<td>10.76%</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>≤ 8.51%</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

**Required Actions**
## Indicator 2: Drop Out

**FFY 2014 Data**

*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))

### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</td>
<td>5,753</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</th>
<th>Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Use a different calculation methodology**

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Indicator 2: Drop Out**

**Required Actions from FFY 2013**

*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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6/29/2016
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup
Historical Data and Targets

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>86.80%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>99.25%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>77.59%</td>
<td>76.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.50%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: □ Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

### Required Actions
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>1/21/2016</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?  
☐ AYP ☐ AMO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>Number of districts that met the minimum &quot;n&quot; size</th>
<th>Number of districts that meet the minimum &quot;n&quot; size AND met AMO</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.11%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>Incomplete Data</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

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
Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading A</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>96.87%</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
<td>97.10%</td>
<td>96.80%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
<td>96.10%</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math A</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>96.87%</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
<td>97.40%</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
<td>96.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

6/29/2016
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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))

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs</td>
<td>12171</td>
<td>12644</td>
<td>12855</td>
<td>11866</td>
<td>11576</td>
<td>11746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>3869</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>7177</td>
<td>8582</td>
<td>9413</td>
<td>9064</td>
<td>8860</td>
<td>9119</td>
<td>7114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Children with IEPs</td>
<td>12171</td>
<td>12644</td>
<td>12855</td>
<td>11866</td>
<td>11576</td>
<td>11746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>3933</td>
<td>2957</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>7253</td>
<td>8707</td>
<td>9508</td>
<td>9170</td>
<td>8991</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>7227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2014 Data

**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))

---

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82,457</td>
<td>79,759</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>96.73%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Participating</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82,457</td>
<td>80,546</td>
<td>96.94%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>97.68%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

---

**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

---

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

---

**OSEP Response**

---

**Required Actions**
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

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.

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

*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**

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>39.00%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.31%</td>
<td>33.60%</td>
<td>39.88%</td>
<td>54.02%</td>
<td>43.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>52.70%</td>
<td>52.80%</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>43.00%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.13%</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
<td>64.11%</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
<td>60.20%</td>
<td>63.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>A ≥</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>A ≥</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

6/29/2016
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.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>11889</td>
<td>12362</td>
<td>12590</td>
<td>11580</td>
<td>11172</td>
<td>11330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8836</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>2678</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>2916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>12029</td>
<td>12506</td>
<td>12701</td>
<td>11696</td>
<td>11328</td>
<td>11412</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>2968</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>4258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>79,759</td>
<td>25,790</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>32.33%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Per the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Indiana and the Indiana Department of Education's Office of Student Assessment:

The Spring 2015 version of ISTEP+ measured student progress on the new college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. These standards, which were first taught during the 2014-15 school year, represent higher-level thinking skills. The results of the new ISTEP+ test reflect an increase in expectations regarding students' knowledge, skills, and abilities.

"Because the 2015 ISTEP+ was the first state assessment to be based on Indiana’s new, more rigorous college and career ready standards, these scores are not comparable to previous pass rates. The 2015 ISTEP+ results established a new baseline for student progress towards college and career ready benchmarks."

As a state, performance on the new assessment showed a decrease in performance across all grades and subgroups.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned</th>
<th>Number of Children with IEPs Proficient</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Overall</td>
<td>80,546</td>
<td>28,522</td>
<td>63.37%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>35.41%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Per the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Indiana and the Indiana Department of Education's Office of Student Assessment:

The Spring 2015 version of ISTEP+ measured student progress on the new college and career ready
Indiana Academic Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. These standards, which were first taught during the 2014-15 school year, represent higher-level thinking skills. The results of the new ISTEP+ test reflect an increase in expectations regarding students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities.

“Because the 2015 ISTEP+ was the first state assessment to be based on Indiana’s new, more rigorous college and career ready standards, these scores are not comparable to previous pass rates. The 2015 ISTEP+ results established a new baseline for student progress towards college and career ready benchmarks.”

As a state, performance on the new assessment showed a decrease in performance across all grades and subgroups.

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](http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/overview.aspx)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
<td>♀♀♀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue – Data Update

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.

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>1/21/2016</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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.

Indiana has 370 LEAs. 295 did not meet the n size and 31 did not have two consecutive years of data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2014 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
The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Required Actions**

In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

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))


Description of review

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) notified the LEAs that the data analysis for the reporting year reflected possible noncompliance 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 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
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.

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the 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 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

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

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA did not correct within a year. This LEA will receive more intensive technical assistance in the next year. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, the LEA will work with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers in order to correct outstanding noncompliance.
Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions
### Historical Data and Targets

**Baseline Data: 2009**

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OSEP Response

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

#### Required Actions
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion  
FFY 2014 Data

**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))

### Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>1/21/2016</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2014 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements</th>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**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.

Indiana has 370 LEAs. 307 did not meet the n size and 31 did not have two consecutive years of data.

**OSEP Response**

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is...
correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
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))


Description of review

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) notified the LEAs that the data analysis for the reporting year reflected possible noncompliance 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).

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 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, 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 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
OSEP Response

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the 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 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

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

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Five LEAs did not correct within a year. These LEAs will receive more intensive technical assistance in the next year. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, the LEAs will work with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers in order to correct outstanding noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**
Indicator 5: Education Environments
(children 6-21)

Historical Data and Targets

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

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C ≤</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ☐ Blue – Data Update

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.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>6/4/2015</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</td>
<td>152,534</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td>
<td>107,606</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td>
<td>16,094</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 107,606 | 152,534 | 70.01% | 68.00% | 70.55% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 16,094  | 152,534 | 10.65% | 11.50% | 10.55% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 3,148   | 152,534 | 2.08%  | 2.15%  | 2.06%  | Met Target | No Slippage |

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.
The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) attributes its overall progress in Indicator 5 to an increased statewide focus on appropriate Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) placements. The IDOE continues to monitor and provide Technical Assistance to LEAs that are not serving students within the placement targets in order to ensure continuous statewide progress for this indicator.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 5: Education Environments
(children 6-21)
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>40.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>40.40%</td>
<td>40.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≤</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>33.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.19%</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A ≥</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>41.50%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B ≤</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>32.90%</td>
<td>32.80%</td>
<td>32.70%</td>
<td>32.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue – Data Update

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.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</td>
<td>17,931</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>7,194</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>b2. Number of children attending separate school</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)</td>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>b3. Number of children attending residential facility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 7,194 | 17,931 | 40.69% | 40.00% | 40.12% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 6,063 | 17,931 | 33.13% | 33.00% | 33.81% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

OSEP Response

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>81.50%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>83.50%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>84.50%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed 2664.00

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers 747.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it 1420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers 337.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers 148.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. 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. \( \frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} \)

\[ \frac{1757.00}{2516.00} = 72.27\% \]

Target: 73.00%

\[ 69.83\% \]

Did Not Meet Target

Slippage

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. \( \frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} \)

\[ \frac{485.00}{2664.00} = 18.21\% \]

Target: 23.00%

\[ 19.83\% \]

Did Not Meet Target

Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Even though the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage and did not meet the targets in both A1 and A2, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning in social and emotional skills. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in this area. The IDOE finished the realignment of the preschool Foundations with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of the preschool standards with K-12 standards have been an adjustment for preschool educators. The IDOE Office of Early Learning in partnership with IDOE Office of Special Education continues to create resources and provide technical assistance for LEAs to help students reach age expectation at exit.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Even though the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) experienced a slippage and did not meet the targets in both A1 and A2, there are still a majority (99.5%) of preschool students that did improve or maintain functioning in social and emotional skills. IDOE will continue to work to provide LEAs with technical assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in this area. The IDOE finished the realignment of the preschool Foundations with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of the preschool standards with K-12 standards have been an adjustment for preschool educators. The IDOE Office of Early Learning in partnership with IDOE Office of Special Education continues to create resources and provide technical assistance for LEAs to help students reach age expectation at exit.
assistance to improve the rate of growth in preschool children in this area. The IDOE finished the realignment of the preschool Foundations with the new Indiana College and Career standards for grades K-6. The alignment of the preschool standards with K-12 standards have been an adjustment for preschool educators. The IDOE Office of Early Learning in partnership with IDOE Office of Special Education continues to create resources and provide technical assistance for LEAs to help students reach age expectation at exit.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>583.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>213.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. ( \frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028.00</td>
<td>2615.00</td>
<td>78.10%</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>77.55%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. ( \frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.00</td>
<td>2664.00</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>9.83%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>507.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>1851.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>237.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. ( \frac{(c+d)}{(a+b+c+d)} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2088.00</td>
<td>2601.00</td>
<td>81.22%</td>
<td>83.50%</td>
<td>80.28%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. ( \frac{(d+e)}{(a+b+c+d+e)} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>2664.00</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>11.26%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used?  No
Indiana Department of Education utilizes the ISTAR-KR assessment tool which provides a method for capturing statistical contract 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.
**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

**Required Actions from FFY 2013**

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**
Historical Data and Targets

Baseline Data: 2009

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

Target ≥  
Data 

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

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.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2014 Data

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2014 SPP/ APR Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6898.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status | Slippage
---|---
Met Target | Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 implemented a new survey format to complete the parent survey in January, 2015. All parents of students age 3-21 that receive special education services had the option to complete the survey after the annual case conference on a computer provided by the school, take home a parent letter and connect to the parent survey at home, or contact the Indiana Department of Education for a paper copy. The response rate for this year did decrease slightly because of not implementing the survey until mid year, however, we do expect the numbers to increase substantially in the next year as schools and parents become used to the new format.

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 IDOE enlisted support from the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), 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 IDOE provided multiple response mechanisms for respondents. Parents were able to respond to a web-based survey or via a paper survey. The survey was offered to respondents in English and in Spanish and they were provided with contact information at IDOE 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. A review of the results by ethnicity shows a correlation between survey respondent demographics and state demographics for students who are in special education.

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:  Indiana Parent Survey English

OSEP Response

Required Actions
## Indicator 8: Parent involvement
### Required Actions from FFY 2013

**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))

### Actions required in FFY 2013 response

| None |

### OSEP Response

**Required Actions**

| |

---
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Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations
Historical Data and Targets

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

### 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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>1/21/16</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services</th>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</th>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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.

Indiana has 370 LEAs. 8 did not meet the n size and 11 did not have two consecutive years of data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the ten districts identified in FFY 2014 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. Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the two remaining 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.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part B Introduction Page</td>
<td>1/21/16</td>
<td>Number of districts in the State</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories</th>
<th>Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification</th>
<th>Number of districts in the State</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target of 0% for the reporting year and had slippage. In the reporting year, when a 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 update Policy and Procedure Survey as well as File Review Rubrics required LEAs to provide more explanation and documentation as compared to previous year. 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’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”. Indiana has a required minimum “n” size of 30 students with a disability in a given population. Indiana includes the total number of LEAs in the state for the denominator. School districts must exceed the data threshold (2.0 or above risk ratio) for disproportionate representation.

Indiana has 370 LEAs. 19 did not meet the n size and 11 did not have two consecutive years of data.

Indiana notified the LEAs that the data analysis reflected possible noncompliance with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in policy, procedure and practice file review. Indiana selected the files based upon a ten percent random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students that were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.
OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the ten districts identified in FFY 2014 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. Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the two remaining 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.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the ten districts identified in FFY 2014 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. Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the two remaining 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.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs 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 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.

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).

IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

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

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.

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.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Two LEAs did not correct within a year. These LEAs will receive more intensive technical assistance in the next year. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, the LEAs will work with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers in order to correct outstanding noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the ten districts identified in FFY 2014 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. Further, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the two remaining 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.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 11: Child Find
Historical Data and Targets

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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>92.30%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.50%</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>97.85%</td>
<td>98.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**
Indicator 11: Child Find
FFY 2014 Data

**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))

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received</th>
<th>(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,376</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>98.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.26%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]** 77

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.

- **Total # of Evaluations Missed by 1-5 Instructional Days**: 38
- **Total # of Evaluations Missed by 6-10 Instructional Days**: 7
- **Total # of Evaluations Missed by 11-15 Instructional Days**: 6
- **Total # of Evaluations Missed by 16+ Instructional Days**: 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Shortages</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of Referrals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Conflicts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline Errors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Tracking</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Documentation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Errors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 State’s timeline for initial evaluations?

*Indiana's established timeline is 50 days.*

### 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 2014 (SY 14-15) 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 11: Child Find
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 11: Child Find
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the process of conducting the initial evaluation within timeline parameters. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. 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 FFY2013 were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, all outstanding noncompliant initial evaluations were completed, although late. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system and verified the LEA achieved the 100% percent compliance requirement.

**FFY 2013 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 2013 (SY 13-14), 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Additional monitoring and data submissions are required as a part of the Corrective Action Plan.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.80%</td>
<td>93.40%</td>
<td>91.70%</td>
<td>92.74%</td>
<td>97.80%</td>
<td>93.96%</td>
<td>98.93%</td>
<td>99.04%</td>
<td>98.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2014 Data

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator (c)</th>
<th>Denominator (a-b-d-e)</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>98.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 7 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 the two children did not receive a FAPE due to a failure on the part of the LEA. The range of days beyond the third birthday is from 8 to 103 days. The reasons include staff tracking errors and a systemic staffing issue for one LEA that was a carryover from the past that has been addressed already. IN currently is working with one LEA on intensive technical assistance with training embedded into the LEA to help with all aspects of eligibility and timelines.

Attached PDF table (optional)
No PDF table was attached

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 2014 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, 2015, and ranged from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015 in order to encompass the entire reporting year.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to 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 FFY2013 and subsequent years 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 2013 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. For those
LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2013 (SY 13-14) or earlier, the previously developed CAP was evaluated for effectiveness and updated to reflect more comprehensive activities. The LEAs that were not able to verify correction of policies and procedures will continue to receive consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and participate in required corrective action as identified above.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2012</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to 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 FFY2013 and prior years 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 and verified the LEA achieved the 100% percent compliance requirement.

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The LEAs that were issued findings were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) that would identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and would 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.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the
specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Historical Data and Targets

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
FFY 2014 Data

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>81.05%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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’ transition IEPs. The review was conducted to ensure that IDOE meets the reporting requirements and is providing ongoing assistance for school corporations with compliance rates less than 100%.

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

IDOE provided CCLC with a population database of students who were receiving special education services and met the Indiana transition IEP age criteria for the monitored school year and whose local school districts are part of the monitoring cycle. The database included the Student Test Number (STN), which is the State of Indiana’s student identification number and the Corporation Code Number. To generate the sample, CCLC used Microsoft Excel software to run a random sampling program. If the corporation had less than 100 students with disabilities, three students were selected for the review. For corporations with more than 500 students, 10 students were selected. Therefore, a minimum of 3 and maximum of 10 Transition IEPs were reviewed based on size of the district. In some cases, charter schools had sample sizes of less than three students because these schools were serving limited number of students or did not have large populations.
of students with disabilities. A report of the review is then provided to IDOE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issued 43 Indicator 13 findings that were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition IEP Requirements Checklist. 41 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 41 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 individual case of noncompliance was corrected

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions
**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

**Historical Data and Targets**

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.80%</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>35.80%</td>
<td>36.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.30%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>33.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.10%</td>
<td>49.60%</td>
<td>51.10%</td>
<td>63.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.10%</td>
<td>56.40%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
<td>63.80%</td>
<td>60.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.60%</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>87.60%</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.10%</td>
<td>76.10%</td>
<td>77.90%</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
<td>37.80%</td>
<td>38.30%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>64.50%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>65.50%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>78.00%</td>
<td>78.50%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>79.50%</td>
<td>86.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

**Required Actions**
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school</th>
<th>199.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A carefully selected random sample was used for a sampling methodology and it is much more accurate when considering such issues as validity and reliability from a classical statistical standpoint. In fact, you will see classical statistics applied in the attached report, something that would not have been possible if Indiana had used a census method, where Indiana may have obtained a large number of responses, but discovered afterwards it was only a fraction of the number needed to establish some degree of confidence in the obtained results. A complete description of the sampling process that was approved by OSEP is explained in Appendix C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSEP Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response
None

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.02%</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>80.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
- Blue – Data Update

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.

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.43%</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
<td>82.61%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Required Actions
**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**  
Required Actions from FFY 2013

*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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 16: Mediation
Historical Data and Targets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥ 52.00%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
<td>53.64%</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 52.00%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥ 75.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>76.50%</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Blue – Data Update

### 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.

### OSEP Response

#### Required Actions
Indicator 16: Mediation
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overwrite Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/5/2015</td>
<td>2.1 Mediations held</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2014 SPP/ APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2014 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 16: Mediation
Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2013 response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

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

 Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Explanation of Changes

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

After the initial submission of Phase I of the SSIP for Indiana, there were several factors that led to the need to revisit the data analysis process and reset both baseline data and targets for the future goals of the Indiana SIMR. During the 2013-14 school year, Indiana adopted new standards, which led to a more rigorous assessment of these standards across all assessments, including the IREAD3 Assessment. This also led to an almost 10% decline in proficiency scores for the IREAD3 for all students, and subgroups of students, including those students with disabilities. Given this change in standards and subsequent performance dip, it was approved by OSEP TA providers that Indiana could reset the baseline measure for the SSIP SIMR using the 2014 IREAD3 data. Additionally, the target group of students for the SIMR changed based on the SDN infrastructure.

In late spring 2015, Indiana’s Division of School Improvement developed a new structure to support districts. This national model for the State Development Network was developed and supported by Mass Insight. Essentially and specific to Indiana, the SDN fosters collaborative efforts and shared investment across departments and programs to support low-performing districts and schools. The intent is to leverage departments and programs to provide aligned and coherent supports within and across participating districts to improve their priority and focus schools. The Office of Special Education saw this new initiative as an opportunity to combine resources and provide state of the art solutions for struggling learners. The SSIP was incorporated into the SDN structure and is now considered a part of this network of support.

The new targeted group of students, is a larger sample size of students including all students with disabilities, receiving free and reduced lunch attending elementary schools within the SDN Cohort 1. This includes sixty three elementary schools and approximately 945 students out of the 1,147 total number of third graders with disabilities in these schools.

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target ≥</td>
<td>45.66%</td>
<td>46.16%</td>
<td>46.66%</td>
<td>52.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

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

The comprehensive SSIP Stakeholder group was included in analysis of the updated data using the IREAD3 2014 data set, and the SDN 3rd grade data for students with disabilities. Stakeholders evaluated achievement gap data and helped to determine the appropriate parameters for setting future targets based on the identified trends within the SDN student data. Stakeholders felt it was important to consider the impact of significant achievement gaps within certain racial and ethnic groups even though the data showed that across all subgroups, students receiving free/reduced lunch underperformed compared to their peers receiving paid lunch. A discrepancy in performance between students receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch was also shown within overall statewide data. Both of these gave support to the emphasis on Indiana’s State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) being focused on students with disabilities in the SDN schools that receive free/reduced lunch. However, within the SDN disaggregate data, African American students with disabilities receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch had an overall performance rate on the IREAD3 that was significantly lower than both the state average, and the performance of all other subgroups of students with disabilities within the SDN. Additionally, white students with disabilities had the largest gap of performance between students receiving paid and free/reduced lunch. The performance of these two subgroups were used as the parameters for setting target. The overall performance of both white and African American students receiving paid lunch for this data report was used as a means of setting parameters for setting the overall growth target for the SSIP. As a result of...
SDN practices, incremental growth of .5% is expected for the first years of SSIP Implementation. It is expected that the students that have received SSIP Implementation support from K-3rd grade will demonstrate a significant amount of growth and this will be shown during the FFY19 IREAD3 assessment year. Additionally, it is the goal of Indiana to scale up implementation and share the lessons learned through this model both within the SDN and across the state. It is possible that growth from participation in SDN related supports or from shared professional learning around the SSIP Partnering LEAs and Site Schools will result in a greater rate of performance than anticipated.

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

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

April 1, 2015- Submitted during Phase I

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

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

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) representatives and a broad scope of stakeholders from across Indiana focused their work on developing Indiana’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). SSIP Core Team members include: the Assistant Director of Special Education for IDOE, the Part B Data Manager for IDOE, an IDOE Education Specialist, and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRC) 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.

Overview

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

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement
Plan
Data and Overview

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.

Data Analysis

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

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

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

Stakeholders were provided with raw data in regard to student results on assessments, including math and reading, as well as disaggregated data including bar graphs, pie charts and trend lines. The facilitator of the meetings led the discussion of the whole group, ensuring each stakeholder member had a common understanding of the data findings in order to understand the related needs based on these findings. The stakeholders were then asked to have conversations in small groups (each included a mix of the stakeholders, i.e. family representatives, teachers, administrators, state personnel). These conversations included discussions about potential data trends and possible implications from these trends. The discussion in both the large and small groups began with a broad analysis of the data then pointed discussion that helped to narrow the analysis process. Once the external stakeholder group had analyzed the data, the information was shared with an internal stakeholder group. The discussion with the internal group included identification of the current IDEO 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 IDEO, 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.

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

After the initial submission of Phase I of the SSIP for Indiana, there were several factors that led to the need to revisit the data analysis process and reset both baseline data and targets for the future goals of the Indiana SIMR. During the 2013-14 school year, Indiana adopted new standards, which led to a more rigorous assessment of these standards across all assessments, including the IREAD3 Assessment. This also led to an almost 10% decline in proficiency scores for the IREAD3 for all students, and subgroups of students, including those with disabilities. Given this change in standards and subsequent performance dip, it was approved by OSEP TA providers that Indiana could reset the baseline measure for the SIMR using the 2014 IREAD3 data. Additionally, the target group of students for the SIMR changed based on the State Development Network (SDN) infrastructure. The new targeted group of students is a larger sample size of students including all students with disabilities, receiving free and reduced lunch; attending elementary schools within the SDN Cohort 1. This includes sixty three elementary schools and approximately 945 students out of the 1,147 total number of third graders with disabilities in these schools. The comprehensive SSIP Stakeholder group was included in analysis of the updated data using the IREAD3 2014 data set, and the SDN 3rd grade data for students with disabilities. Stakeholders evaluated achievement gap data, and helped to determine the appropriate parameters for setting future targets based on the identified trends within the SDN student data. Stakeholders felt it was important to consider the impact of significant achievement gaps within certain racial and ethnic groups even though the data showed that across all subgroups, students receiving free/reduced lunch underperformed compared to their peers receiving paid lunch. A discrepancy in performance between students receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch was also shown within overall statewide data. Both of these gave support to the emphasis on Indiana’s State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) being focused on students with disabilities in the SDN schools that receive free/reduced lunch. Also within the SDN disaggregate data, African American students with disabilities receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch had an overall performance rate on the IREAD3 that was significantly lower than both the state average, and the performance of all other subgroups of students with disabilities within the SDN. Additionally, white students with disabilities had the largest gap of performance between students receiving paid and free/reduced lunch. The performance of these two subgroups were used as the parameters for setting the target. The overall performance of both white and African American students receiving paid lunch for this data report was used as a means of setting parameters for the overall growth target for the SSIP. Incremental growth of 0.5% is expected for the first years of SSIP implementation, based on the indirect influence of practices that are being implemented both within the SDN Site schools and the primary support of the LEA participation within the State Development Network. It is expected that the students that have received SSIP implementation support from K-3rd grade will demonstrate a significant amount of growth and this will be shown during the FFY19 IREAD3 assessment year. Additionally, it is the goal of Indiana to scale up implementation and share the lessons learned through this model both within the SDN and across the state. It is possible that growth from participation in SDN related activities or from shared professional learning around the SSIP Partnering LEAs and Site Schools will result in a greater rate of performance than anticipated.

Please refer to Appendix F-Data Analysis Update within the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation which includes disaggregated data used by stakeholders, as well as an explanation of the new baseline and targeted goals for improvement over Phase II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

April 1, 2015-Submission of Phase I Report-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 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.”

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

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

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

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

Data and Overview

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.

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).

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

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

The State Identified Measureable Result for Indiana:

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

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

In order to determine the SIMR, disaggregated data for reading performance by area of exceptionality, LRE, race, school lunch status, and gender were shared and displayed for the stakeholder groups to review for trend implications. A graphic representation of each of the disaggregation displays of this data is attached. The data indicated that students with language and speech impairments and specific learning disabilities in the purposeful sample group were the largest areas of exceptionalities represented. In a disaggregation of data for all students with disabilities in Indiana who did not demonstrate proficiency in passing statewide assessments in English language arts/reading, students with specific learning disabilities did not meet proficiency expectations. 77% of students with specific learning disabilities are receiving their instruction in a general education setting for 80% or more of the day, 22% receive their instruction in a resource room setting, and only 2% of those students are receiving instruction in a self-contained special education setting.

When comparing the racial demographics of the purposeful sample group to their general education peers within the LEAs they reside within, the data was comparable. Therefore, there did not appear to be any implication related to race for the purposeful sample group. In both state and purposeful sample data, there are significantly more male students than female students identified with specific learning disabilities in third grade. Also significant for the development of the SIMR is the impact of poverty as related through school lunch status. 73% of the students in the purposeful sample group receive free lunch. After analyzing the graphic displays of the data and the trend implications, the stakeholders discussed how these implications could be developed as a State Identified Measureable Result. Stakeholders agreed to an initial SIMR that focused on improvement of reading outcomes for third and fourth grade male students identified with specific learning disabilities receiving free lunch. After it was determined that the most reliable measurement tool for determining baseline and targets and measuring future growth would be Indiana’s IREAD-3 assessment, this further narrowed the focus to third grade students since IREAD-3 is given only to third graders.

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

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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

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

Statement

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

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

The State Identified Measureable Result for Indiana:

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

Description

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

In order to determine the SIMR, disaggregated data for reading performance by area of exceptionality, LRE, race, school lunch status, and gender were shared and displayed for the stakeholder groups to review for trend implications. A graphic representation of each of the disaggregation displays of this data is attached. The data indicated that students with language and speech impairments and specific learning disabilities in the purposeful sample group were the largest areas of exceptionalities represented. In a disaggregation of data for all students with disabilities in Indiana who did not demonstrate proficiency in passing statewide assessments in English language arts/reading, students with specific learning disabilities did not meet proficiency expectations. 77% of students with specific learning disabilities are receiving their instruction in a general education setting for 80% or more of the day, 22% receive their instruction in a resource room setting, and only 2% of those students are receiving instruction in a self-contained special education setting.

When comparing the racial demographics of the purposeful sample group to their general education peers within the LEAs they reside within, the data was comparable. Therefore, there did not appear to be any implication related to race for the purposeful sample group. In both state and purposeful sample data, there are significantly more male students than female students identified with specific learning disabilities in third grade. Also significant for the development of the SIMR is the impact of poverty as related through school lunch status. 73% of the students in the purposeful sample group receive free lunch. After analyzing the graphic displays of the data and the trend implications, the stakeholders discussed how these implications could be developed as a State Identified Measureable Result. Stakeholders agreed to an initial SIMR that focused on improvement of reading outcomes for third and fourth grade male students identified with specific learning disabilities receiving free lunch. After it was determined that the most reliable measurement tool for determining baseline and targets and measuring future growth would be Indiana’s IREAD-3 assessment, this further narrowed the focus to third grade students since IREAD-3 is given only to third graders.

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

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

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

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

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

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

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.

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.

[Updated SSIP TOA- Logic Model Alignment] Updated SSIP TOA- Logic Model Alignment

Illustration

☑ Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

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

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

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

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

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.

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

The support for implementation of the evidence based practices is embedded in several tiers. In the first tier, LEAs within the State Development Network (SDN) will receive guidance and professional development focused on system alignment and evidence based practices to support all eight Turnaround Principles. Each LEA is provided a Case Manager who completes monthly check in calls highlighting specific systemic alignment practices and Turnaround Principles. The Case Managers also assist with providing resources and technical assistance to guide their implementation of the district wide High Quality Plan (HQP).

In the second tier, LEAs with SSIP site schools will receive additional intensive technical assistance to develop and align district goals and implementation planning within the district High Quality Plan (HQP), School Improvement Plan (SIP) or Student Achievement Plan (SAP) and Reading Plan. The SDN districts will meet quarterly with IDEO staff and additional resource providers to receive intentional and targeted PD to support the development and coordination of systemic alignment. Each PD session provided to the SDN offers Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) for district improvement in three key Turnaround Principles: Leadership, Data, and Instruction.

In the third tier of support, site schools within the SDN will receive the most intensive assistance for implementation of the SSIP. They will receive technical assistance for MTSS implementation beginning during the 2016-17 SY, and assistance developing and aligning their district HQP to specific areas of Root Cause within their individual schools. The site schools will receive an on-site visit focused on determining potential areas of root cause for poor reading achievement outcomes for students with disabilities and struggling learners. During the Root Cause Analysis on site visit, classroom observations during reading instruction in grades K-3 will be completed, along with interviews of all providers of reading instruction, or reading interventions. This visit will be followed up with the building leaders completing a Partner's Inventory aligned to the Turnaround Principles with district level administrator support. The findings from this visit will be shared with school and district level staff via a formal report with recommendations aligned to the areas of root cause and the menu of EBPs that were identified as high leverage practices by the Instructional Practices Advisory Council for the SSIP. Coordinated technical assistance and professional development will be embedded within all the district and school required plans based on these recommendations and LEA and school leader decisions.

IDOE used a group of stakeholders, (Instructional Practices Advisory Committee) to review the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) that were identified by the National Center for Systemic Improvement as “high leverage” practices for addressing the areas of root cause that were identified during PHASE I. Additionally, all of these practices were evaluated based on their capacity to meet the needs of all students, including those with disabilities or struggling to learn, by upholding rigorous academic standards and high expectations for all. These practices were in support of improving quality reading instruction, improving early literacy instruction, and increasing high expectations within leaders and teachers for students with disabilities and struggling learners. Additional research for best practices was provided for systemic alignment, and Multi-tiered Systems of Support. The Instructional Practices Advisory Council (IPAC), included experts from IDEO in the area of Reading, Early Learning, Outreach, and Special Education, as well as outside experts in the area of PBIS, UDL and Inclusive Practices. This team reviewed each practice and selected practices based on their alignment to the areas of needs, potential for successful implementation and support for improving outcomes for students with disabilities with regard to the Indiana’s State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR). It was determined through the activities of the pilot school that providing a menu of these practices within the Root Cause Analysis (RCA) visit report that align specifically to the needs of the school would allow for individual school autonomy and would address possible adaptive challenges.

The following bulleted points identify the requisite Implementation Drivers or the key components of capacity building and infrastructure development that will influence successful implementation of the SSIP in Indiana. These are the core components needed to initiate and support classroom, building, and district level change. These have been identified as possible drivers that may vary depending on the individual needs of the districts, schools, and classrooms that are participating in the SSIP. The SSIP Core team within each site school will evaluate their planning for implementation and individual selection of EBPs against the Implementation Driver rubric. Identified levels of support for implementation within each driver for the selected EBPs will be contingent on the specific site school needs and this evaluation process. These drivers will be evaluated after the completion of the RCA visit report, and during the development of the HQP and site school's SIP and Reading Plans.

- Competency Drivers:
  - Recruitment/Selection of Staff (within current school infrastructure or outside, coaches, leaders, etc.) to utilize EBPs
  - Training needs for staff around use of EBPs
  - Coaching needs to support implementation and fidelity of EBPs use
  - Performance and Assessment of Fidelity of implementation of EBPs

- Organization Drivers:
  - Decision/ Support Data Systems that will ensure outcomes of implementation, both with regard to fidelity of implementation, and students outcomes related to the selected EBPs
  - Facilitative Administrative Supports needed for EBPs (implementation team structure, policies and procedures, use/utilization of data to inform work, reduction of barriers)
  - Systems Intervention, what is needed to address barriers within the system for implementation of the EBPs, protocols, and leadership capacity

- Leadership Drivers:
  - Technical Leadership needs related to the implementation of selected EBPs (reasons for changes, guidance for expectations and clarity about what needs to be done)
  - Adaptive Leadership needs with alignment of the implementation of selected EBPs to the goals, vision and mission of the LEA, and school, and levels of communication to meet needs of staff.
In order to provide the TA/PD needed to support the implementation of the EBPs that a site school has selected, IDOE will work collaboratively with the Key Advisors to identify which supports would align best to the selected EBPs and RCA needs as well as the evaluation of the Drivers for Implementation of those EBPs selected. The additional TA/PD required to support the selected EBP will be provided in combination by the Indiana Resource Network staff, or possibly by an outside PD provider if this is appropriate. See the Menu of Evidence Based Practices found in Appendix B of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation. IDOE will provide support to the site school SSIP teams for planning and ongoing implementation evaluation. IDOE SSIP Core Team members will participate in monthly SDN and SSIP calls with site schools to ensure effective implementation of all plans that support SSIP goals.

As a part of the SSIP implementation process, regular evaluation of the Partnering LEAs and SSIP site schools' plans and practices will be reviewed. As progress with implementation drivers is made, additional scaling up of the practices will be supported. Additionally, information regarding the outcomes of these practices will be shared within the SDN and also through the Promising Practices- Making It Happen initiative as a means to encourage non-SDN LEAs/ schools to consider these practices as a means to improve outcomes for all students.

Please see attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation- IN-SSIP- specific steps and tools that will be used during each step of implementation can be found within this comprehensive manual.

**Evaluation**

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State’s progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

Indiana has utilized the Leading by Convening tools for engaging stakeholders. Specifically identifying circles of participation and potential roles that various stakeholders can play in the Indiana SSIP. It is through these tools that additional stakeholders have continued to be identified and will continue to be identified as the SSIP plan begins to move into Phase III within the partner LEAs and site schools involved in the SSIP. The large group feedback network identified as the SSIP Stakeholder Committee has met quarterly during Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP implementation process. Members of this group were initially invited to participate during Phase I as representatives of various education organizations, parent support organizations, IDOE departments, and education related roles. Members have continued to be added as the planning has evolved during Phase II. It is planned that this large group will continue to meet quarterly either in person or virtually in order to review and gather evaluation feedback for Phase III of implementation. As evidenced in the visual display of the Indiana SSIP Circles of Participation, varying stakeholders are part of this feedback network and also play other roles.

Implementation and outcomes will be measured with data sources including interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders; professional development and meetings; review of process documents and records including professional development material; school demographic data; student performance results including benchmark assessments, and results on state standardized tests.

During the infrastructure analysis conducted in Phase I and development of the TOA, Indiana identified the SDN as an existing initiative that will be used to support the collection of data related to implementation of EBPs and the impact on student performance. Indiana reviewed data extensively to determine SSIP sample group within the SDN is representative of the state population. This data will continue to be reviewed, with the support of an external evaluator, to ensure consistency. Each time data is collected, the criteria will be analyzed according to short, medium and long term outcomes. In addition, current SDN protocols used for data collection are being reviewed and aligned to accurately reflect the data collection requirements of the SSIP and SIMR.

The SSIP process and intended outcomes will be continuously evaluated throughout implementation. Feedback loops were carefully designed to reflect the Theory of Action and align with the Logic Model to provide a framework to evaluate, reflect and inform course corrections.

Within the feedback loop, Indiana has included evidence collection at each stage to ensure active monitoring and successful implementation. For each evidence stage, Indiana is collecting documentation such as materials, agendas, and evaluations of engagement and is developing tools for collecting data related to implementation fidelity and outcomes. This type of evidence will be collected throughout technical assistance and professional development related to RCA, District Data Review, and EBPs. In addition, rubrics and protocols are being developed to guide coaching, classroom observation and impact of implementation of EBPs. As evidence is collected, it will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of professional development, fidelity of implementation, and impact on student performance. Indiana will continuously monitor and make appropriate adjustments to SSIP to reflect feedback and data.

Please see attached Comprehensive Implementation Manual which includes graphics and descriptions of various steps within the Evaluation Process.

**Technical Assistance and Support**

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

IDOE leveraged the assistance from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and other federally funded TA Centers throughout SSIP Phase I and II development and initial implementation as follows:

- Participation in bi-weekly to monthly check in calls to: 1) discuss timelines, tools, and resources to
support SSIP development and implementation; 2) deliberate outstanding or emerging questions concerning the SSIP; 3) identify areas where support is needed; 4) problem solve specific issues or emerging barriers/challenges; 5) identify opportunities to collaborate and coordinate with other TA providers and/or states.

- Guidance - including modeling - of facilitated activities to secure broad stakeholder engagement and input into the analysis and design of SSIP recommendations. Specifically in the identification and selection of the evidence-based practices prioritized within SSIP strategies.
- Participation in NCSI’s Systems Alignment Cross State Learning Collaborative and the subsequent virtual meetings to support Indiana efforts to align school turn around/improvement efforts and the SSIP. Specific support in IDOE’s logic model and theory of action.
- Guidance and support in the SiMR revisions and related benchmarks.
- Identification of evidence-based literacy instruction, high-leverage instructional strategies, and leadership school turn around strategies, via a NCSI technical assistance response.
- Identification of existing observation rubrics assessing literacy instruction, via a NCSI technical assistance requests.
- Coordinated discussion between IDOE and the South Carolina Department of Education to facilitate collaboration and coordination concerning the modification of IDC’s Success Gap Rubric to meet comparable SSIP approaches.
- Identification of universally available tools and resources to support preservice and in-service professional learning in the identified evidence-based practices (e.g. CEEDAR Early Reading Innovation Configurations and Course Enhancement Modules).

IDOE plans to continue this level of collaboration and coordination with NCSI as follows:

- Consult and problem solve on strategies to advance and monitor fidelity of implementation at both the SEA and LEA levels.
- Development and refinement of the co-drafted literacy instruction observation rubric from the CEEDAR and NCSI Center.
- Training concerning the use of the literacy observation rubric and/or CEEDAR’s K-5 Reading Instruction Course Enhancement Module, as needed and requested.
- Continued participation in the Systems Change Cross State Learning Collaborative. As desired, participation in the Literacy Cross State Learning Collaborative.
- Continued guidance concerning data collection toward benchmarks and targets.

Additionally, IDOE intends to utilize the strong infrastructure of Stakeholder engagement and participation established for the Indiana SSIP and identified in Appendix E of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation of the IN-SSIP. That said, the IDOE SSIP Team Leader will develop a schedule for regular check in calls, virtual and/or face to face meetings with the national and Indiana Resource Network TA providers, SDN Case Managers, and Partnering LEAs/Site School SSIP Teams to ensure technical assistance activities are aligned with expectations within the SSIP and being provided as needed to support the plans of the Partnering LEAs. This communication will also allow for opportunities to leverage all available TA resources to provide the type of professional learning and support needed to strengthen teacher and leader practice. These meetings will involve monthly/bi-monthly progress/status reports from each respective TA Center as well as SSIP Partnering LEA and Site Schools. These reports will demonstrate the centers’ purposeful alignment and support of the SSIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSEP Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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