IMAGINING the possibilities. MAKING THEM HAPPEN.

Indiana Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Indiana Part B Annual Performance Report

As required by 20 U.S.C. 1416 Sec. 616(b) of the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004

Submitted to the United States Office of Special Education Programs

Revised May 17, 2013

Table of Contents

Indiana Acronyms Used in SPP/APR 3
General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR) 6
Indicator 1 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 9
Indicator 2 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 15
Indicator 3 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 19
Indicator 4A of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 26
Indicator 4B of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 38
Indicator 5 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 51
Indicator 6 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 56
Indicator 7 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 59
Indicator 8 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 64
Indicator 9 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 71
Indicator 10 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 80
Indicator 11 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 93
Indicator 12 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 101
Indicator 13 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 107
Indicator 14 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 114
Indicator 15 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 119
Indicator 18 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 136
Indicator 19 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011 138

Indiana Acronyms Used in SPP/APR

AAMAS	Alternate Assessment based on Modified Achievement Standards
AATF	Alternate Assessment Task Force
AEPS	Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System
AHEAD	Association on Higher Education and Disability
APR	Annual Performance Report
ASAP	Indiana Accountability System for Academic Progress
ASK	About Special Kids
AUT or ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorder
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
BLV	Blind or Low Vision
BDDS	Bureau of Developmental Disabilities Services
CAAVES	Consortium for Alternate Assessment Validity and Experimental Studies
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CCC	Case Conference Committee
CCLC	Center on Community Living and Careers
CCSSO	Council for Chief State School Officers
CD	Communication Disorder
CEEP	Center for Evaluation and Education Policy
CEL	Center for Exceptional Learners
CIFMS	Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System
CMAADI	Consortium for Modified Alternate Assessment Development and Implementation
CODA	Computerized Data Project (CODA)
CRSWPBS	Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports
CTQ	Center for Improving Teacher Quality
DAC	Data Accountability Center
DANS	Data Analysis Network System
DHH	Deaf or Hard of Hearing
DOC	Department of Correction
ED	Emotional Disability
EDEN	Education Data Exchange Network
EI	Educational Interpreter
EIS	Educational Information Systems
ELL	English Language Learners
ESY	Extended School Year
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year (July 1 – June 30)
FSSA	Family and Social Services Administration
GED	Graduation Equivalency Diploma
GEI	General Education Interventions
GQE	Graduation Qualifying Examination
GSEG	General Supervision Enhancement Grant
HI	Hearing Impairment
HOUSSE	High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation
HQT	Highly Qualified Teachers
IASEP	Indiana's Assessment System of Educational Proficiencies
IAC	Indiana Administrative Code
IC	Indiana Code
ICAN	Individualized Classroom Accountability Network
ICASE	Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education
ICRC	Indiana Civil Rights Commission
IDEA 2004	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004

Acronyms

IDOE	Indiana Department of Education
IEM	Integrated Electronic Management system
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IHE	Indiana Institutions of Higher Education
IHO	Independent Hearing Officer
IN*SOURCE	Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs
INPSFS	Indiana Post-Secondary Follow-up System
IN-SIG	Indiana State Improvement Grant
IPSFS	Indiana Post-School Follow-up System
IRN	Indiana Resource Network
ISTAR	Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting
ISTAR-KR	Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting-Kindergarten Readiness
ISTART7	Indiana Standards Tool for Article 7 Compliance
ISTEP+	Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LEAD	Local Equity Action Development
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MCD	Multiple Disabilities
MICD	Mild Mental Disability
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOCD	Moderate Cognitive Disability
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCCRES	The National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems
NCEO	National Center on Educational Outcomes
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
NCRRC	North Central Regional Resource Center
NCSE	National Council for Special Education
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
NDPC	National Drop-out Prevention Center
NECTAC	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
NPSO	National Post-Secondary Outcomes
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center
OHI	Other Health Impaired
OI	Orthopedic Impairment
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs of the US Department of Education
PART	Program Assessment Rating Tool
Part B	Special Education under IDEA 2004 (ages 3-21)
Part C	Infant and Toddler Special Education under IDEA 2004 (birth to 3)
PBIS	Positive Behavior Interventions and Support
PIRC	Parent Information Resource Center
RFP	Request for Proposal
RPR	Regional Parent Resources
RTI	Response to Intervention
SAC	State Advisory Council on Children and Youth with Disabilities
SBE	State Board of Education
SEA	State Educational Agency
SIQ	Student Information Questionnaire
SLD	Specific Learning Disability Learning Disability
SLP	Speech/language Pathologist
SCD	Severe Mental Disability
SOP	Summary of Performance
SPP	State Performance Plan

Acronyms

SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
STN	Student Test Number
SW-PBIS	Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
SY	School Year (dependent on local calendar)
TA	Technical Assistance
TBI	Traumatic Brain Injury
US DOE	United States Department of Education
VI	Visual Impairment
VR	Vocational Rehabilitation

General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR):

SPP and APR Development:
The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) serves the citizens of Indiana by fulfilling its statutory responsibilities, implementing the policies of the Indiana State Board of Education (SBE), and supporting the priorities of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The IDOE focuses its resources to promote higher standards and greater levels of achievement for all students. The Office of Special Education (OSE) is an integral component of the IDOE, ensuring a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for all students with disabilities within the State of Indiana.

The IDOE provides leadership and state-level support for students with disabilities from ages 3-21. The IDOE also ensures that Indiana is in compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), through monitoring of special education programs, protection of mediation and due process rights, and sound fiscal management.

In 2004, the United States Congress reauthorized IDEA as IDEA 2004. IDEA 2004 requires the United States Secretary of Education to monitor states in three priority areas, including: the provision of a FAPE in the LRE, general supervision, and disproportionate representation. This monitoring is done through consideration of 20 indicators. [See 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)-(C)]. Additionally, pursuant to IDEA 2004 each state must submit monitoring reports—the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the Annual Performance Report (APR).

The SPP is effective for an eight-year time period and includes an overview of each of the 20 indicators, a description of the system or process, baseline data and discussion of the data for each indicator, measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities (including timelines and resources for implementation). The APR is an annual report to the US Secretary of Education on the performance of the state under each state's SPP and includes actual target data for the given reporting federal fiscal year (FFY), discussion of improvement activities completed, explanation of progress or slippage for that given year and, if applicable, revisions to proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines and resources. The APR is submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), which then provides a response and determination of the State's reported status.

This APR is a summary and report on Indiana specific information for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The performance component of the APR is based off of the SPP, which was originally submitted in December, 2005. Indiana revised and submitted its SPP in conjunction with the submission of the FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) APR in order to provide a more concise and consistent vision of Indiana's monitoring system, which has undergone vast changes since the original SPP submission. Indiana also revised its SPP for the FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) submission of the APR in order to extend targets and improvement activities through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) as required by OSEP. Indiana modified its SPP in collaboration with the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), Indiana's stakeholder group.

General Supervision and Monitoring:
During the summer of 2009, a major restructuring of the general monitoring and supervision system occurred in Indiana, including a reorganization of both staff and processes of the monitoring team. This restructuring and reorganization serves to streamline the State of Indiana's monitoring processes to promote the timely identification and correction of all instances of noncompliance. An outcome of that restructuring process is an understanding of how the general supervision and monitoring from the Office of Special Education contributes to the larger vision of the IDOE. In 2009, the IDOE committed to a vision of 90-25-90. This vision encompasses 90% of students passing the math and language arts portion of the state standardized assessment (ISTEP+) and end of course assessments; 25% of students receiving a score of 3, 4, or 5 on at least one advanced placement exam, a 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate exam, or receiving the equivalent of 3 semester hours of college credit during their high school years; and 90% of students graduating from high school. Due to this rigorous standard of achievement for all students, a number of notable changes to the IDOE monitoring process were made in FFY 2010 (SY10-11). The IDOE monitoring team now consists of a broad range of staff members with varied backgrounds and expertise, each

focused on a smaller number of individual indicators, while working collaboratively towards a unified, encompassing approach to general supervision. Additionally, careful consideration has been made regarding the activities and strategies for assisting Indiana schools in overall improvement in areas of education of students with disabilities, including a problem solving process that assists local educational agencies (LEAs) in data based decision making that impacts student outcomes. Indiana has committed to setting high expectations for all LEAs, holding them accountable for providing a FAPE in the LRE, while allowing for flexibility at the local level to ensure innovation and excellent outcomes for all students. With this consideration Indiana partnered with its State Advisory Council on Education for Students with Disabilities (SAC) and the Indiana Council of Special Education Administrators (ICASE) and has updated its General Supervision and Monitoring protocol. Beginning in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Annual Performance Report, new protocol has been utilized for the purposes of identification of noncompliance. Indiana has identified, by indicator, specific times within the SPP/APR reporting period in which it reviews compliance data from the database to identify noncompliance. In addition, Indiana has identified, by indicator, other times of which data is analyzed for purposes of targeted technical assistance for LEAs. This methodology change has allowed for data related to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 to be evaluated on a cyclical basis for LEAs allowing concentrated efforts on not only compliance monitoring but increased technical assistance by IDOE education specialists. This change to a cyclical system has made comparing data from FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) difficult in some indicators. Information pertaining to data changes can be found within each individual indicator under the section heading of "Discussion of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2011".

The monitoring team benefited from the guidance and assistance from the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), Data Accountability Center (DAC) as well as the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in the restructuring of the monitoring program. In addition, the IDOE also utilized material posted to the Regional Resource Federal Centers (RRFC) Network SPP/APR calendar and has ensured that monitoring methods are consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02[1].

Public Reporting:
The IDOE has previously reported to the public on the SPP and APR in various venues including web postings at the IDOE website (http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring), collaborations with stakeholder groups and professional organizations such as the ICASE and the Indiana SAC and through regional and statewide conferences. Indiana will continue to utilize these methods for reporting progress and/or slippage on each indicator as well as strive to investigate other methods that allow all stakeholders in Indiana to take an active role in ensuring that Indiana continues to meet the requirements set forth in IDEA 2004.

In addition to seeking support from ICASE, Indiana has sought advice from the SAC. The SAC met regularly throughout FFY 2011 and was updated on each Indicator in order for the SAC to have the opportunity to provide broad stakeholder input on many critical improvement activities as well as processes utilized by the IDOE

In order to continue to report annually on the progress of each LEA in the state in meeting the targets set forth in the SPP, Indiana will post documents that have been submitted to each LEA that outline any findings of noncompliance as well as the LEAs percentage in meeting those compliance indicators. For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), letters of noncompliance can be found at (http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring). The IDOE will post a preliminary version of the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR corresponding with its submission to OSEP on February 15, 2013 to its public website[2]. After the APR is approved, the IDOE will post any updates to the APR at the same location. The IDOE will present information from the APR and each LEA's performance on Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 by publishing information on the website as required by OSEP. In addition, progress and slippage data described in the APR will be shared with the SAC in March of 2013.

[1] OSEP Memorandum 09-02
[2] http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring

Local Determinations:
The IDOE makes Local Determinations based upon LEA performance on compliance Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. In addition, the State considers Indicator data, audit findings, uncorrected noncompliance, and timely submission of required documentation and accuracy of data when making Local Determinations as required by IDEA 2004. The IDOE made determinations and sent notification to each LEA in January of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). Determinations were based on LEA data from FFY 2010 (SY 10-11), audit findings, timely and accurate data findings and uncorrected noncompliance from instances occurring during FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

OSEP Response Table:
Based on Indiana's submission of the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR and revised SPP, the IDOE received a response table from OSEP that outlined Indiana's status by indicator. In addition to comments from OSEP regarding progress on each indicator next steps were also identified. The OSEP Part B FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Response Table instructions and Indiana's response for each Indicator may be found in the "Additional Information Required by OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator" section at the conclusion of each indicator.

Indicator 1 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with Individual Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Overview of the Indicator:
The data and targets reported for the Indicator are for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) rather than for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) based on the modification of the measurement for the indicator from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The improvement activities discussed below were completed during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

In Indiana the graduation requirement for students with an IEP is the same for all students. Indiana Code states the following:

IC 20-26-13-5 "Graduation"
Sec. 5. (a) As used in this chapter, "graduation" means the successful completion by a student of:
(1) a sufficient number of academic credits, or the equivalent of academic credits; and
(2) the graduation examination or waiver process required under IC 20-32-3 through IC 20-32-6; resulting in the awarding of a high school diploma or an academic honors diploma.
(b) The term does not include the granting of a general educational development diploma under IC 20-20-6 (before its repeal) or IC 22-4.1-18.

Indiana's Diploma Requirements allow for four diploma types. These requirements went into effect for students entering high school in the fall of 2006. The four diploma types include the following:

- General
- Core 40
- Core 40 with Academic Honors
- Core 40 with Technical Honors

The Indiana General Assembly has made completion of the Core 40 diploma a graduation requirement for all students beginning with those entering high school in the fall of 2007. For more detailed information regarding the conditions for obtaining a Core 40 diploma, please see Attachment 1.1 located immediately following this Indicator.

The Indiana Legislature changed the graduation rate calculation formula to utilize the Student Test Number (STN) system beginning with the entering class of 2006.[3] STN system collects all statewide data as Indiana's data warehouse and includes many layers of built in data and validity checks. The STN data system is aligned with ESEA requirements, and for more detailed information regarding the STN Cohort Graduation Rate in alignment with the ESEA, please see Attachment 1.2 located immediately following this Indicator.

[3] Indiana State Performance Plan (SPP). Page 4, Indicator 1

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for Indicator 1
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	Special education graduation rate, with diploma, will be one percent improvement over the prior year with the goal of ≥ 95% as established under ESEA and defined under 511 IAC 6.2-7-8.[4]

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Calculation	Numerator: # Graduates (ages 17-22)	Rate
	Denominator: # Graduates + # Certificates + # Drop-outs (ages 16-22) + # Maximum Age	%
FFY 2006 (SY 06-07)	4,945	54.93%
	4,945 + 1,029 + 2,939 + 191 = 9,003	
FFY 2007 (SY 07-08)	5,450	55.71%
	5,450 + 1,297 + 2,936 + 99 = 9,782	
FFY 2008 (SY 08-09)	5,898	58.95%
	5,898 + 1,325 + 2,700 + 82 = 10,005[5]	
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	5,403	69.38%
	5,403 + 1096 + 1241 + 41 = 7788[6]	
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	5,995	**75.79%**
	5,995 + 995 + 851 + 69 = 7910[7]	

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):
As per OSEP instructions, Indiana is reporting the graduation rate percentage for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

The current target, as outlined in Indiana's SPP and as established through ESEA and defined under 511 IAC 6.2-7-8, is defined as annual improvement in the graduation rate towards a rate of 95% with the final target rate of 95%.

Indiana's actual target data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) improved 6.41% from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10), which represents progress on the Indicator. Indiana also met its target of improvement of one percent improvement over the prior year towards 95% for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Foster Mentoring/Tutoring relationships such as the Best Buddies project.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Best Buddies Indiana had 66 schools (4 middle school, 16 colleges, and 46 high schools) with active Best Buddies chapters in FFY 2011, serving 1063 buddy pairs. The program targets students with disabilities that are likely to drop out of high school and/or struggle in the academic curriculum and pairs each student with a mentor to foster educational growth. Support for Best Buddies is specifically marked as a State budget line item.

[4] For high schools, graduation rate as determined under Indiana code 511 IAC 6.2-2.5-9 , for classes of students who expect to graduate in the 2005-2006 school year and subsequent school years; that increases toward a rate of ninety-five percent (95%)
[5]Reported data for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting
[6]Reported data for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting
[7]Reported data for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting

Regional Program Specialists employed by IN*SOURCE (the Indiana Resource Center for families with special needs); collaborate with IDOE, parents, schools to keep students in school.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA 2004 grantee and parent advocacy group, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), conducted a variety of presentations and workshops across the state. The training sessions often focused on helping parents and educators understand the special education process and concepts. The training events were conducted in collaboration with other agencies such as the IDOE, Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC), About Special Kids (ASK), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) and many LEAs from across the state. Individual assistance was also an important part of the support provided to families in pursuit of assistance for their children with disabilities. This assistance and consultation was provided via meetings, phone calls, e-mail and letters. IN*SOURCE maintained a website for the distribution of help to parents. The online resources provided parents easy access to important information and provided a forum to exchange ideas and information with other parents. To learn more regarding IN*SOURCE go to http://www.insource.org/
The transition school to work Interagency Coordinating Council, (known as the "290 Committee") address statewide issues as they relate to transition. **Added to Indicator 1 as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Statewide Transition Policy Work group met 4 times this past year to conduct a policy analysis between Article 7 and VRS Transition Policy. Once the analysis was completed, feedback and input was sought through all stakeholders (School personnel, VRS staff and family members) at the Statewide Transition Forum and the INAPSE Employment Conference from approximately 95 individuals. The purpose of the feedback was to gather data on what is actually occurring in practice and provide recommendations for changes in VRS Policy and Procedures. Currently, those recommendations are being reviewed by the Statewide Transition Policy Workgroup with an outcome a revised policy and/or procedures for school and VRS collaboration.

Dropout Prevention Grant Proposal Competition	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE through the Office of College and career Readiness offered a new Dropout Prevention Grant Proposal Competition. The competition was offered over the summer of 2012. Ten school corporations and 2 charter schools were selected to be eligible for the Dropout Prevention Fund Grants. These corporations were selected based on an average graduation rate (spanning 3 consecutive years), an average dropout rate (spanning 3 consecutive years), percentage of students receiving of free/reduced lunch, percentage of students who failed End of Course Assessment (ECA) English 10, and percentage of students who failed ECA Algebra 1. Two schools were selected to receive funds for SY2012-13 and SY2013-14 based on a rubric that was sent to the schools along with the initial proposal. The two schools will receive $40,000 SY2012-13 and SY2013-14 – with a possible $20,000 the third year, if all the criteria is met.
Alternative Education Grant Proposal	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana offers the Alternative Education Grant Proposal. Any Indiana LEA may submit a proposal for a new alternative education program which must offer students a mode of instruction they would not otherwise receive in the traditional classroom. Most programs offer credit recovery for students via a software program, but many also offer project based learning, community service learning opportunities, job shadowing, jobs, etc. In FFY 2011 this grant produced 186 new programs.
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
Indicator 1 data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) represents Indiana's highest score on the Indicator since the graduation rate calculation was changed. The State also improved 6.41% from the previous year and met its target for the third consecutive year. Indiana has dedicated an increased focus on student outcomes, and additional Improvement Activities have been implemented to ensure continued progress.

Additional Information Required by OSEP FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.	No response required.

Attachment 1.1

Course and Credit Requirements to Obtain a Core 40 Diploma[8]	
English/ Language Arts	8 credits Including a balance of literature, composition and speech.
Mathematics	6 credits 2 credits: Algebra I 2 credits: Geometry 2 credits: Algebra II Or complete Integrated Math I, II, and III for 6 credits. All students must complete a math or physics course in the junior or senior year.
Science	6 credits 2 credits: Biology I 2 credits: Chemistry I or Physics I or Integrated Chemistry-Physics 2 credits: any Core 40 science course
Social Studies	6 credits 2 credits: U.S. History 1 credit: U.S. Government 1 credit: Economics 2 credits: World History/Civilization or Geography/History of the World
Directed Electives	5 credits World Languages Fine Arts Career-Technical
Physical Education	2 credits
Health and Wellness	1 credit
Electives*	6 credits (Career Academic Sequence Recommended)
40 Total State Credits Required	

Schools may have additional local graduation requirements that apply to all students
* Specifies the number of electives required by the State. High school schedules provide time for many more electives during the high school years. All students are strongly encouraged to complete a Career Academic Sequences (selecting electives in a deliberate manner) to take full advantage of career exploration and preparation opportunities.

[8] All course requirements for the various diploma types is also available at the following website: http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/curriculum/indianas-diploma-requirements

Attachment 1.2

STN Cohort Graduation Rate Explanation:

TO CALCULATE THE DENOMINATOR FOR THE GRADUATION COHORT RATE:
STEP ONE: Determine the grade 9 enrollment at the beginning of the reporting year three years before the reporting year for which the graduation rate is being determined.

(EXAMPLE: If the graduation year being determined is 2008-2009, the grade 9 enrollment from 2005-2006 would be calculated for each school).

STEP TWO: Add the number determined under step one, and:

- The number of students who have enrolled in the high school after the date on which the original cohort (STEP ONE) was determined and have the same expected graduation year

(EXAMPLE): A student enrolls in the school as a 10th grader in 2006-2007. The student's expected graduation year is 2008-2009. The student is added to the cohort.

STEP THREE: Subtract from the sum (STEPS ONE and TWO) the number of students who have left the cohort for any of the following reasons:

- Transfer to another public or nonpublic school
- Removal by the student's parents to provide homeschooled instruction
- Withdrawal because of a long term medical condition or death
- Detention by a law enforcement agency or the department of correction
- Placement by a court order or the department of child services
- Enrollment in a virtual school
- Leaving school, if the student attended school in Indiana for less than one school year and the location of the student cannot be determined
- Leaving school, if the location of the student cannot be determined and the student has been reported to the Indiana clearinghouse for information on missing children and missing endangered adults
- Withdrawing from school before graduation, if the student is a high ability student (defined in IC 20-36-1-3) who is a full-time student at an accredited institution o higher education during the semester in which the cohort graduates

All of these types of students do not "count against" a school's graduation rate and are removed from the denominator.

TO CALCULATE THE NUMERATOR FOR THE GRADUATION COHORT RATE:
STEP FOUR: Determine the total number of students from STEP ONE and STEP TWO who have graduated during the current reporting year OR a previous reporting year (early graduates).

TO CALCULATE THE GRADUATION COHORT RATE:
STEP FIVE: Divide the numerator (number of graduates) by the denominator (number in the cohort, minus students who were removed due to reasons described in STEP THREE).

- A student never "switches" cohorts; the student remains with the same cohort throughout. Early graduating students do not "count against" a school district or school—instead they are counted for the school district/school in the cohort year that the student would have graduated.

Indicator 2 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with Individual Education Programs (IEPs) dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

> **Measurement:** States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Overview of the Indicator:
The data and targets reported for the Indicator are for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) rather than for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) based on the modification of the measurement for the indicator from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The improvement activities discussed below were completed during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

The Indiana Legislature changed the graduation rate calculation formula to utilize the Student Test Number (STN) system beginning with the entering class of 2006.[9] The STN system collects all statewide data as Indiana's data warehouse and includes layers of built-in data and validity checks. The STN data system is aligned with ESEA requirements.

The components of the dropout/mobility rate are the same for students with IEPs as they are for general education students. Indiana Code states the following:

511 IAC 6.1-1-2
(h) "Dropout" means a student who:
- (1) was enrolled in school during the current school year or the previous summer recess;
- (2) left the educational system during the current school year or the previous summer recess;
- (3) has not graduated from high school; and
- (4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - (A) Death.
  - (B) Temporary absence due to suspension or a school excused absence.
  - (C) Transfer to a public or nonpublic school

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for Indicator 2
2010 (SY 10-11)	The drop-out rate for students with disabilities is ≤ 22% using the four-year dropout rate methodology.

[9] Indiana State Performance Plan (SPP). Page 4, Indicator 1

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Calculation	Numerator: # Drop-outs (ages 16-22)	Rate
	Denominator: # Graduates + # Certificates + # Drop-outs (ages 16-22) + # Maximum Age	%
FFY 2006 (SY 06-07)	2,938	32.63%
	4,945 + 1,029 + 2,938 + 91 = 9,003	
FFY 2007 (SY 07-08)	2,936	30.01%
	5,450 + 1,297 + 2,936 + 99 = 9782	
FFY 2008 (SY 08-09)	2,700	26.99%
	5,898 + 1,325 + 2,700 + 82 = 10,005[10]	
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	1241	15.93%
	5,410 + 1096 + 1241 + 41 = 7788[11]	
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	851	**10.76%**
	5,995 + 995 + 851 + 69 = 7910[12]	

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):
Indiana has met its target for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). This data represents progress of 5.17% from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) to FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). This data represents the second consecutive time Indiana has met its target for this Indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Foster Mentoring/ Tutoring relationships such as the Best Buddies project.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Best Buddies Indiana had 66 schools (4 middle school, 16 colleges, and 46 high schools) with active Best Buddies chapters in FFY 2011, serving 1063 buddy pairs. The program targets students with disabilities that are likely to drop out of high school and/or struggle in the academic curriculum and pairs each student with a mentor to foster educational growth. Support for Best Buddies is specifically marked as a State budget line item.
Regional Program Specialists employed by IN*SOURCE (the Indiana Resource Center for families with special needs); collaborate with IDOE, parents, schools to keep students in school.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA 2004 grantee and parent advocacy group, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), conducted a variety of presentations and workshops across the state. The training sessions often focused on helping parents and educators understand the special education process and concepts. The training events were conducted in collaboration with other agencies such as the IDOE, Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC), About Special Kids (ASK), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) and many LEAs from across the state. Individual assistance was also an important part of the support provided to families in pursuit of assistance for their children with disabilities. This assistance and consultation was provided via meetings, phone calls, e-mail and letters. IN*SOURCE maintained a website for the distribution of help to parents. The online resources provided parents easy access to important information and provided a forum to exchange ideas and information with other parents. To learn more regarding IN*SOURCE go to http://www.insource.org/

[10]Reported data for Indicator 2 in the FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting
[11]Reported data for Indicator 2 in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting
[12]Reported data for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR were harvested from the State's reported 618 Table 4, Exiting

Partner with Regional Resource Center for multi-state strategy identification.	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE regularly accessed, utilized and distributed information from the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities by conveying information from the center's website to LEAs and IDOE program specialists.
The transition school to work Interagency Coordinating Council, (known as the "290 Committee") address statewide issues as they relate to transition. **Added to Indicator 2 as of FFY 2011 (FY 11-12).**	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Statewide Transition Policy Work group met 4 times this past year to conduct a policy analysis between Article 7 and VRS Transition Policy. Once the analysis was completed, feedback and input was sought through all stakeholders (School personnel, VRS staff and family members) at the Statewide Transition Forum and the INAPSE Employment Conference from approximately 95 individuals. The purpose of the feedback was to gather data on what is actually occurring in practice and provide recommendations for changes in VRS Policy and Procedures. Currently, those recommendations are being reviewed by the Statewide Transition Policy Workgroup with an outcome a revised policy and/or procedures for school and VRS collaboration.
Dropout Prevention Grant Proposal Competition	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE through the Office of College and career Readiness offered a new Dropout Prevention Grant Proposal Competition. The competition was offered over the summer of 2012. Ten school corporations and 2 charter schools were selected to be eligible for the Dropout Prevention Fund Grants. These corporations were selected based on an average graduation rate (spanning 3 consecutive years), an average dropout rate (spanning 3 consecutive years), percentage of students receiving of free/reduced lunch, percentage of students who failed End of Course Assessment (ECA) English 10, and percentage of students who failed ECA Algebra 1. Two schools were selected to receive funds for SY2012-13 and SY2013-14 based on a rubric that was sent to the schools along with the initial proposal. The two schools will receive $40,000 SY2012-13 and SY2013-14 – with a possible $20,000 the third year, if all the criteria is met.
Alternative Education Grant Proposal	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Any Indiana LEA may submit a proposal for a new alternative education program which must offer students a mode of instruction they would not otherwise receive in the traditional classroom. Most programs offer credit recovery for students via a software program, but many also offer project based learning, community service learning opportunities, job shadowing, jobs, etc. In FFY 2011 this grant produced 186 new programs.
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Indicator 2 data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) represents Indiana's best score on the Indicator to date. The State also improved 5.17% from the previous year and has met its target for the second consecutive year. Indiana has dedicated an increased focus on student outcomes, and additional Improvement Activities have been implemented to ensure continued progress.

Additional Information Required by OSEP FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No response required.

Indicator 3 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with Individualized Education Programs (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 (Adequate Yearly Progress) 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))

Measurement:
A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.
B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
C. Proficiency rate percent = ([(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Overview of the Indicator:
For the Indicator, FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) results are reported using test scores administered during the spring of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through the Education Exchange Network (EDEN). Assessment data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) submitted through the EDEN system in the 618 Table 6 on January 18, 2013 matches the data used in this Indicator.

Indiana applied for and was granted a waiver of the requirements to determine AYP for LEAs and schools as part of requesting ESEA flexibility. Due to this, Indiana is using AMO data rather than AYP data for Indicator 3A for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Public Reporting Information:
Public reports of assessment results, conforming with 34 CFR §300.160(f), are available at the following websites:
http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/assessment/istep-results *(Indiana Statewide Assessment - ISTEP)*
http://www.doe.in.gov/improvement/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports
(See "Alternate and Modified Assessments" heading for the IMAST and ISTAR alternate assessments)
(Under the "ISTEP+ 2012" heading is the report on students with disabilities participation in the statewide assessment with and without accommodations)
Details regarding AMO data will publicly available at www.doe.in.gov by March 2013.

Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

FFY 2011	Measurable and Rigorous Targets									
	Districts Meeting AMO for Special Education Subgroup (3A)		Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)				Proficiency for Students with IEPs (3C)			
Targets for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	95.0%		Reading		Math		Reading		Math	
			95%		95%		38%		44%	
Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	243	**77.0%**	79452	**95.5%**	79550	**95.6%**	43870	**52.7%**	51651	**62.1%**

3.A - Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for Indicator 3A
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	LEAs meeting AYP[13] in the subgroup of students with disabilities ≥ 95.0%.

Percent of the districts with a Special Education subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size[14] that meet the State's AMO targets for the Special Education subgroup:

Year	Total # of Districts	Number of Districts Meeting the "n" size	Number of Districts that meet the minimum "n" size and met AMO	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	349	313	243	**77.0%**

The table below was included in Indiana's approved application[15] for ESEA flexibility and represents Indiana's new statewide AMO for the Special Education subgroup. This information was utilized in calculating AMO for Indicator 3A.

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			44%	54%		4%		61%
2012-13			Increase by 5 percentage points in ELA and 3 percentage point in Math	49%	57%	Increase by 1 percentage point	5%	Increase by 3 percentage points	64%

[13] Indiana applied for and was granted a waiver of the requirements to determine AYP for LEAs as part of ESEA flexibility. Indiana is using AMO data for Indicator 3A for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).
[14] "n" size is 30
[15] Indiana's approved application is available at the following url: http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/requests

3.B – Actual Participation Target Data for FFY 2011:

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for Indicator 3B
2011 (SY 11-12)	The rate of participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments is ≥ 95%.

Math Participation rate for children with IEPs:

Statewide Assessment 2011-2012		Math Assessment								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	Total #	Total %
a	Children with IEPs	12446	12852	12657	11950	11826	11725	9778	83234	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4275	3379	2412	1541	1155	927	1874	15563	18.7%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5139	5610	5987	6405	6761	6955	6023	42880	51.5%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	1948	2677	3009	2703	2393	2098	0	14828	17.8%
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	708	811	853	848	944	1088	1027	6279	7.5%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	12070	12477	12261	11497	11253	11068	8924	79550	**95.6%**
Children included in *a* but not included in the other counts above										
In your narrative, account for any children with IEPs who did not participate.		376	375	396	453	573	657	854	3684	**4.4%**

Reading Participation rate for children with IEPs*:*

Statewide Assessment 2011-2012		Reading Assessment								
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Total	
									#	%
a	Children with IEPs	12446	12852	12657	11950	11826	11725	9778	83234	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4244	3364	2415	1551	1164	904	1623	15265	**18.3%**
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4955	5447	5770	6114	6489	6784	6493	42052	**50.5%**
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0.0%**
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	2088	2813	3198	2946	2595	2214	0	15854	**19.0%**
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	708	811	853	848	944	1088	1029	6281	**7.5%**
g	Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	11995	12435	12236	11459	11192	10990	9145	79452	**95.5%**
Children included in *a* but not included in the other counts above										
In your narrative, account for any children with IEPs who did not participate.		451	417	421	491	634	735	633	3782	**4.5%**

The following are reasons that a student with an IEP was not considered a participant in the assessment:

- Students whose assessment results were considered invalid
- Parent opts out of student taking assessment
- Student was absent during assessment
- Medically unfit for testing
- Students did not participate for other reasons that included expulsion and suspension, students who were not enrolled at the time of testing, and students whose grade level was marked in error.

Accommodations and Valid Scores:

- Accommodations yielding valid scores: Tests taken by students who were provided accommodations that have been approved by the State are considered valid and the students should be included as participants.
- Accommodations may be approved in one of two ways: (1) in most cases approved accommodations are on a State list of preapproved accommodations; (2) Indiana allows the IEP team to seek approval from the State Education Agency (SEA) for use of non-standard accommodations that do not appear on the list. In these cases, if the State determines that the accommodation does not invalidate the score, students receiving these accommodations will be included as participants.
- Students who received invalid scores due to an accommodation that was not approved by the State are counted as non-participants. In making the calculations, these students are included in the

denominator (# of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window), but NOT in the numerator (# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment).

- Under certain circumstances, students whose scores are considered invalid for any other reason may be considered participants, consistent with Indiana's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Accountability Workbook.

3.C – Actual Performance Target Data for FFY 2011

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for Indicator 3C
2011 (SY 11-12)	The number of students with disabilities with reported proficiency on statewide and alternate assessment is ≥ 38% English/Language Arts and ≥ 44% Mathematics.

Actual Target Data for Performance:

Math Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards:

Statewide Assessment 2011-2012		Math Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	12446	12852	12657	11950	11826	11725	9778	83234	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5881	8897	5729	4653	3852	3999	3990	37001	**44.5%**
c	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0%**
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	1585	1879	2060	1652	1243	1126	0	9545	**11.5%**
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	495	617	680	657	782	952	922	5105	**6.1%**
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	7961	11393	8469	6962	5877	6077	4912	51651	**62.1%**

Reading Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards:

Statewide Assessment 2011-2012		Reading Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	12446	12852	12657	11950	11826	11725	9778	83234	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	5962	5011	4033	3421	2921	2597	3298	27243	**32.7%**
c	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0.0%**
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards	1686	2195	2493	2195	1652	1362	0	11583	**13.9%**
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	515	631	694	637	763	922	882	5044	**6.1%**
f	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	8163	7837	7220	6253	5336	4881	4180	43870	**52.7%**

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

FFY	Indicator 3A Percentage
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	77.0%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	99.3%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	97.7%

Because this is the first year AMO data rather than AYP data is used to calculate Indicator 3A, Indiana cannot report on progress or slippage for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). This new baseline data will be utilized in establishing new targets on this Indicator based on the new statewide AMO for the subgroup.

FFY	Indicator 3B Percentages	
	Reading	Math
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	95.5%	95.6%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	96.6%	96.9%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	95.6%	96.2%

Indiana has met its targets of 95% in Reading participation and 95% in Math participation.

FFY	Indicator 3C Percentages	
	Reading	Math
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	52.7%	62.1%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	50.0%	56.9%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	43.2%	50.7%

Indiana has met and exceeded its targets of 38% in Reading proficiency and 44% in Math proficiency.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Develop and implement the Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test (IMAST)	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	Indiana continues to administer and support the IMAST, Indiana's alternate assessment against grade-level standards, allowing students to be assessed based on the student's individualized needs. Indicator outcomes data are taken directly from the IMAST assessment, comparison of students taking ISTEP+ against IMAST by disability category.
Through the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) and Indiana Center for Assessment and Instruction (ICAI), provide tools, training and technical assistance as schools increase student achievement, build staff capacity and align resources.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	The ICAI continues to provide best practices professional development statewide concerning ISTEP+ accommodations, ISTAR, ISTAR-KR and the Modified ISTEP+ and work with the IDOE Assessment Division to provide accurate information. The ICAI also acts as a statewide resource to LEAs and schools on the accessibility of instruction, Universal Design for Learning, and differentiated instruction while working with IDOE staff to coordinate this information.
Focused efforts at developing standards-based IEPs, with a focus on the middle and high school levels.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	Indiana continues efforts focused on the development of standards-based IEPs with an emphasis on the middle and high school levels.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data for Indicator 3A represents Indiana's new baseline data for this Indicator. Indiana will work to set new targets for Indicator 3A with stakeholder imput for the FFY 2012 (11-12) submission of the APR, due February 1, 2014.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
3A: OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No response required.
3B: OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No response required.
3C: OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No response required.

Indicator 4A of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4A: Rates of suspension and expulsion:
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.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:
The State utilized the September 2010 enrollment count and the data collected on Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2010-2011 due November 1, 2011.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Identification of Comparison Methodology:
As reported in the FFY 2010 Indicator 4A APR, the Office of Special Education (OSEP) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC) review of Indiana's Significant Discrepancy definition for Indicator 4B, Indiana was required to change its 4B definition of Significant Discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. Due to the fact that Indiana was required to change its Indicate 4B definition and method of calculation for significant discrepancy, it was decided to modify its Indicator 4A definition and calculation methodology to better address the issue of Significant Discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities.

On January 13, 2012, in response to the downward trend in the number of LEAs that were exceeding the established incident rate threshold, the Indiana Special Education Advisory Council (SAC) reviewed and provided input on Indiana's revised Indicator 4A significant discrepancy definition. The State lowered the Indicator 4A incident rate threshold from 3.0 times or higher than the State average to 2.0 times or higher than the State average for two consecutive years.

Indiana 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 or higher than the State incidence rate for two consecutive years." The sample "n" size is set at a minimum of 10 students in a given population. A review of policies, procedures and practices is conducted for those LEAs designated as having significant discrepancy to determine if the discrepancy is due to the LEA's failure to comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and the execution of procedural safeguards.

Indiana compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State when determining if significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)).

Indicator 4A: Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY 2011 based on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 11-12) (*using 2009 & 2010 data*)	The percent of LEAs meeting the criteria for statistical significance as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year will be equal to/or less than 1.25%.

Actual target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) based on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) Data:
Indiana's significant discrepancy definition requires an LEA to exceed the established threshold for two consecutive years; therefore the State utilized the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) data when reporting significant discrepancy in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR.

4A(a). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion:

Year	Total Number of LEAs[16]	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies	Percent
FFY 2011 (using 2009 & 2010 data)	**356**	**9**	**2.53%**

As reported in the FFY 2010 APR the State elected to change the definition of significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A in response to the downward trend in the number of LEAs that were exceeding the established incident rate threshold, as previously described.

The FFY 2011 (SY11-12) statistical analysis based the on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) data indicated 2.53% (9 out of 356) LEAs had significant discrepancies in the rates for suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities. 279 LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the required "n" size of 10 or more students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year.

Nine LEAs were notified on July 27, 2012 of FFY 2011 Indicator 4A significant discrepancies. On August 8, 2012 the nine LEAs were required to complete the Indiana FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey by August 24, 2012. The IDOE and its contracted agent reviewed and analyzed the nine surveys. Follow-up telephone interviews and email exchanges were conducted when necessary with the LEAs regarding their survey, policies, procedures and practices. Based upon the review of the surveys and supporting documentation, it was determined that it would be necessary to conduct an individual file review on all nine of the LEAs with significant discrepancies to determine if appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22). The IDOE selected the files based upon a ten percent random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students with disabilities that were suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days during the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

4A(b). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy in Rates for Suspension and Expulsion of Students with Disabilities that Were the Result of Inappropriate Policies, Procedures and Practices:

[16] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (356) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

Year	Total Number of LEAs[17]	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies that were the Result of Inappropriate policies, Procedures and Practices	Percent
FFY 2011 (using 2009 & 2010 data)	**356**	**6**	**1.69%**

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices *completed in FFY 2011 using FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 data for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies:*

The file review analysis indicated that the significant discrepancies in six of the nine LEAs were due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices, and these six LEAs were determined to be noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22).

Five of the six LEAs determined to have significant discrepancies due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices were issued FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Indicator 4A Findings of non-compliance with 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22) on November 9, 2012. The five LEAs *were* also informed that pursuant to 20 USC § 1416(a)(3), the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one-year from the date of the issuance of this correspondence. The five LEAs were informed that they are required to:

1. 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; and,
2. Correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student is no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, all six of the LEAs identified with FFY 2011 (SY11-12) noncompliance were informed that they are required to work with the IDOE and their assigned Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider to develop, implement and monitor a corrective action plan. Progress on this Indicator will be monitored through the general supervision component of the IDOE special education monitoring process.

The sixth LEA was notified on November 9, 2012 that it has continuously failed to correct its FFY 2008 (SY08-09) Finding of noncompliance; therefore the LEA must correct the noncompliance as soon as possible. In addition the LEA must correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2011 file review, unless the student is no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. In order to assure correction, the IDOE has funded and placed a full time compliance specialist in the LEA. This specialist is working with the LEA to correct inappropriate policies, procedures and practices and to oversee all initial evaluations completed to ensure they are done so in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). (See the "Action Taken if FFY 2008 Noncompliance Not Corrected" section below for additional information and sanctions in place for this LEA.)

Discussion of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2011:
The 1.69% noncompliance rate indicates that Indiana failed to meet its measurable and rigorous target of 1.25% or less. The data also indicates that the noncompliance rate slipped from 1.16% in FFY 2010 to 1.69% in FFY 2011. In response to the slippage, the PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive positive behavior interventions and supports. The PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to work with emerging model sites to develop a state-of-

[17] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (356) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator

the-art model of culturally responsive PBIS. The center provides an extensive list of tools that include web-based modules, publications and other resources on culturally responsive practices, disproportionality, leadership teams and PBIS frameworks.

The six LEAs with FFY 2011 Indicator 4A noncompliance are required to attend the Indiana Disproportionality/Inclusion conference scheduled for February 27 thru March 1, 2013.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) using 2009-2010 data	**3**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**3**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**0**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):
The state determined that all three LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Findings of noncompliance on January 31, 2012 had corrected their noncompliance within one year. The state verified that the three LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2010 finding of Indicator 4A noncompliance and each of the three LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2010 Findings for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Systemic Noncompliance**:**

  The state verified systemic correction of the three LEAs FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Individual Cases of Noncompliance**:**

  The state verified that the three LEAs had corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2010 Finding of Indicator 4A noncompliance. The three LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
100% of the LEA's issued FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indicator 4A Findings of noncompliance, corrected the noncompliance within one year.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings (identified in July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010 using 2008-2009 data), noted in OSEP's June 27, 2012 FFY 2010 APR response table for this Indicator	**0**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Indiana did not make any Indicator 4A FFY 2009 (SY09-10) findings of noncompliance.

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):
Indiana did not issue any FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
Indiana did not issue any FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance:

4. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings (identified in July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 using 2007-2008 data), noted in OSEP's June 27, 2012 FFY 2010 APR response table for this Indicator	**1**
5. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
6. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**1**

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):
The one remaining LEA that was issued a FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance has failed to correct. The FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Findings of noncompliance were based on identified systematic procedure and policy flaws that caused noncompliance in the LEA. Indiana's FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) significant discrepancy and monitoring process did not identify student specific cases of noncompliance, therefore there were no identified student specific cases to correct. However, as indicated above, the individual issues of noncompliance were specified in the FFY 2010 notification of continued non-compliance dated January 31, 2012.

While the LEA failed to correct the FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance, the state did verify on January 25, 2013 that the LEA did correct each individual student specific issue of noncompliance associated with the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) review.

Actions Taken if FFY 2008 Noncompliance Not Corrected:
The State reviewed its improvement activities and determined that no changes were necessary at this time.

The analysis of the remaining LEA with the FFY 2008 (SY08-09) Indicator 4A noncompliance indicates the LEA has failed to subsequently correct. The analysis of the issues pertaining to why the noncompliance has remained indicates that the LEA has had a lack of appropriate policies and procedures as well as appropriately trained personnel to implement sufficient structures to ensure compliance. The LEA has taken action to correct the deficiencies as they have employed a new Superintendent as well as an Executive Director of Special Education. In order to ensure correction of this indicator, the IDOE has funded a full time compliance specialist in the LEA. This specialist is working with the LEA to correct inappropriate student discipline policies, procedures and practices regarding 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A.

As outlined in the FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report, the State had taken multiple actions to ensure correction of this finding for the 1 remaining LEA. In addition to the onsite DOE compliance specialist, special conditions were placed on the LEAs FY 2012 and FY 2013 Federal Part B grant pursuant to 34 CFR §80.12.

The special conditions outlined that the LEA would be ineligible to submit for reimbursement for expenditures encumbered for expenses until two reports outlining their compliance with regulations had been submitted. The first report was due to the IDOE on December 1, 2012. The LEA failed to submit the report and thus have continued to be ineligible for reimbursement.

Due to the extent of the ongoing issues, the LEA is required to continue to work with three of the IRN resource centers (Effective Evaluation, Effective and Compliant IEPs, and HANDS in Autism) during FFY 2012 (SY 12-13). These three centers, along with IDOE central office staff and the assigned on-site IDOE compliance specialist will work with the LEAs administrative team that includes representation from the Superintendent's office, general and special education administrators, building principals, district supervisors and consultants, federal programs, school nurses, social workers, IT staff, school psychologists, and an independent hearing officer. Information continues to be provided regarding LEA data related to suspensions and expulsions. The LEA administrative team as mandated developed a committee for special education compliance in order to review and monitor local practices and policies related to suspension and expulsion. IRN center staff and the DOE assigned compliance specialist will guide, facilitate and monitor the direction of the LEA in these practices. In addition, the centers will coordinate school visitations and discussions with LEA staff and administration in efforts to address areas related to reducing behavior-related referrals and suspensions and expulsions such as data management, proactive strategy implementation, alternative skill development and general behavioral planning. The IRN centers provide guidance, support and monitoring for the LEA to develop and implement an extensive corrective action plan that the IDOE is closely monitoring.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Coordinate activities with the School Wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiative, a systems approach to effective school-wide management that provides a comprehensive continuum of supports.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive positive behavior supports. The project continues to work with emerging model sites to develop a state-of-the-art model of culturally responsive PBIS. The center collaborates closely with national leaders and a state advisory team to support a statewide PBIS network, including training and technical assistance. PBIS Indiana offered regional trainings throughout the state to scale up CR-PBIS across the state. This includes 25 schools working on Tier 1 supports and 26 schools working on Tier 2 supports. In addition, PBIS Indiana continues to work in the 4 assigned intensive districts providing technical assistance and support.
LEAs identified with significant discrepancies will receive training in Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The four LEAs with Indicator 4A significant discrepancy reported in the FFY 2010 APR were assigned to work with one or more of the IRN Centers to develop, implement and monitor a LEA plan of correction which included training in Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports.
Indiana Resource Network (IRN): Provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the State to improve teaching and learning via the six Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers whose areas of focus are: • Autism;	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY2012 (SY12-13)	Information regarding the IRN centers a can be found at: http://www.irn.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=Centers The following IRN centers are providing technical assistance related to disproportionality issues: PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center The Indiana University Equity Project at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) in collaboration with the Center for Education and Lifelong Learning at the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community (IIDC) is the IRN center whose focus is to

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
• Effective assessment and instruction; • Effective evaluations; • Effective and compliant IEPs; • Positive behavior supports; and, • Transition to adulthood. In additional statewide support DOE will be provide on: • Parent training and information; • Assistive and accessible technologies; and, Training for teachers of students who are deaf, blind or have low vision.		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. The center is working on the following activities: • Development of an expanded RTI-based model of PBIS that addresses issues of culture and contributes to improved outcomes in achievement, graduation, and LRE; • Development of six model demonstration sites committed to the full implementation of the PBIS Indiana framework. This work includes culturally responsive training at Tier 1, 2, and 3; • Working with sites assigned by the IDOE to address identified insufficiencies through the implementation of the PBS Indiana framework; • Working with schools partially implementing PBIS, providing professional development and technical assistance as needed to move schools at any level of implementation to more complete implementation; • Conducting a survey statewide to assess the level of implementation in schools across the state; • Increasing capacity by building the knowledge base; and, • Development of a fully functioning and sustainable network of culturally responsive PBIS in Indiana. The center has developed an extensive list of tools that include web-based modules, publications and other resources on: • Culturally responsive practices; • Disproportionality; • Leadership teams; and, • PBIS frameworks. Effective Evaluation Resource Center (EERC) The EERC provides statewide professional development as well as targeted technical assistance to LEAs. The EERC focuses on increasing Indiana educators' skills and practices to ensure a) targeted and high quality interventions and strategies for struggling students and b) the use of appropriate special education evaluation procedures and eligibility guidelines for all students. The EERC provides assistance to LEAs in the correction of noncompliance and implementation of systemic changes to prevent future noncompliance. The EERC provided targeted technical assistance and statewide professional development related to appropriate identification practices and outcomes. This included: a) Coordination of the Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum, attended by leadership teams from 15 districts with findings for Indicator 4, 9, and/or 10. Resources and materials were developed to assist teams with root cause analysis and development of a corrective

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		action plan. EERC is providing ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data. b) Onsite technical assistance to LEA district leadership team including review and revision of procedures and practices, text-based discussions, and facilitation of leadership teams and disproportionality committees. c) Development of written and online resources for use by targeted LEAs and schools statewide. Resources focused on topics such as second language learners, assessment of English language learners, culturally responsive practices, and evidence-based behavior interventions. HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center The HANDS in Autism® Interdisciplinary Training & Resource Center provides unique learning opportunities designed to integrate and understand autism and related developmental disabilities through hands-on and coaching experiences. Training and/or consultation opportunities are offered throughout the State and are customized to meet the needs of a particular site determined based on a needs assessment of participants, schools, or the district, verbal feedback, historical review of trainings, and/or verbal discussion with stakeholders requesting such trainings and/or consultation. Such trainings are provided by a multidisciplinary HANDS training team who represent a combination of professionals from the fields of special education, general education, behavioral analysis, school psychology, public health, and clinical psychology. Such a broad range of experience allows us work with different populations and groups and is illustrative of the necessary collaboration involved with successful Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (CRSWPBS) and multidisciplinary teams. Trainings are based upon evidence-based practices in autism, as reported by the National Standards Project and National Autism Center, and in line with the proactive and positive behavioral plans promoted within CRSWPBS. These foundational components (i.e., proactive and positive behavioral plans) are a natural tie to the HANDS training curriculum and evidence based practices purported by the aforementioned report. Another hands-on training opportunity is offered through Summer Training, a week-long intensive training for school personnel that combines didactic training and hands-on experience in the HANDS classroom. In addition to hands-on training and consultations, HANDS in Autism® offers a growing depository of other learning opportunities: - *Workshops for professionals and caregivers:* a series of workshops based on the most popular topics that may include but not limited to creation of visuals supports for specific strategies, Q&A for parents, strategy training, etc.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		Offered live and online. - *eLearning*: self-paced interactive tutorials that range from general information about autism to the use of specific strategies. Upon successful completion of a tutorial and final quiz, participants will get a certificate of completion that could be used towards PGP. - *Web-, podcasts, and videos:* archived webinars on a range of topics. Certificate of completion is available for select options. Videos range from general information about autism to strategy video modeling. - *Training Toolkits:* resource toolkits that range from single strategy training to a setting-specific range of strategies training that could be used to train peers, parents, and colleagues. - *Manuals*: Large publications that offer helpful information and strategies for specific populations (e.g., caregivers of individuals with autism, etc). - *Individual publications:* handouts that range from general information about the disorders to specific strategy-based information, templates for academic and non-academic activities, functional skills training, etc. Materials in Spanish are also available. - *Collaboration with local professionals and families* through the HANDS-initiated Local Community Cadres to meet needs of specific communities in training, material dissemination, and resource development. IN*SOURCE Parent Support Volunteers (PSV): IN*SOURCE continued to provide ongoing activities throughout the state to help support a network of one hundred and seventy (170) PSVs. IN*SOURCE has maintained this volunteer network for thirty-two (32) years. This program has successfully supported many thousands of parents of children with disabilities statewide, using a parent to parent service delivery mode. IN*SOURCE provided information and ongoing training and support to the PSVs via its statewide network of paid staff of Regional Program Specialist (RPS). Individual support to parent volunteers is available on an "as needed" basis and covers many different topics or issues including suspensions and expulsions of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP). During this seventeen month period, this parent volunteer statewide network provided training and assistance to nine hundred and fifty-six (956) families and other contacts statewide. This training and assistance included support to families concerning special education eligibility, eligibility categories and expulsion & suspension of students with IEPs. RPS: IN*SOURCE continued the maintenance of twenty-two (22) regional offices to insure an appropriate level of support for parents and educators in their communities. Statewide support to families and educators reflected in this activity are generally provided on an individual basis, and may include assistance provided by email, telephone or on a face to face basis. RPS in the regional offices

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		assistance to families covered a range of topics concerning the education of students with disabilities. During this seventeen month period, IN*SOURCEs RPS provided assistance to sixteen thousand, three hundred and thirty-six (16,336) families and other contacts statewide. From this number of total contacts, three hundred and thirty-eight (338) contacts included information and support to families concerning suspension and expulsion. Statewide: IN*SOURCE staff also continued its support to parents of children with disabilities and educators statewide by providing both live and online training opportunities. These training programs cover a variety of topics including the special education processes, eligibility, IEPs, transition to adult life, and suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs. During this time period, IN*SOURCE staff conducted four hundred and ten (410) live trainings across the state, reaching seven thousand, five hundred and sixty-eight (7,568) participants. IN*SOURCE also reached three thousand and seventy-eight (3,078) participants through its online library of special education presentations. PATINS Project / ICAM The Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for all Students Project (PATINS Project) state-wide technical assistance network for the provision of assistive/accessible technology supports to assist Indiana's local educational agencies. As a sole source provider for the Indiana Department of Administration and the Indiana Department of Education, the PATINS Project works with local educational agencies to create, locate, and acquire flexible and accessible curricular materials and utilize technology tools that will support students with disabilities and reduce the existing barriers to learning in the classroom. By addressing learner barriers in the classroom through effective and accessible technologies, materials and instruction, the project provides resources (assistive technologies and training) to local educational agencies to develop compensatory strategies and access to tools to reduce the effects of student's disabilities and thereby allowing students to focus their ability on the specific demands of academic tasks and successfully demonstrate acceptable behaviours. The PATINS Project works with schools to reduce potential triggers of undesirable behaviour through the use of assistive technology and effective instruction by: • Utilizing specific assistive technology tools to monitor behaviour during assigned classroom tasks; • Utilizing strategies and assistive technology tools to self-regulate behaviour during academic task performance; • Accessing the curriculum in multiple, flexible and engaging ways • Maintaining a Refurbished Computer program, which supplies students with access who may not have computer access otherwise. • Maintaining and regularly updating an online set of video, text and audio resources available to LEA staff 24/7, • Maintaining a state-wide repository and delivery system of accessible instructional materials and,

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		• Utilizing assistive technology to help students manage behaviours associated with social components of classroom activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011(if applicable):
There are no proposed changes to the improvement activities, timelines or resources for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the FFY 2010 Response Table	State's Response
The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b).	All three LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Findings of noncompliance corrected within one year. See Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance section above.
The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, based on FFY 2008 data, as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected.	The state did not make any Indicator 4A Findings in FFY 2009 however; the state did issue three Indicator 4A FFY 2008 Findings of noncompliance. Two of the three FFY 2008 LEAs either corrected timely or subsequently. One of the three LEAS continues to have uncorrected FFY 2008 noncompliance. See Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance section above.
When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each district noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, and each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).	Noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: The state verified correction systemic and individual cases of noncompliance. See Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance section above. Noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 SY 09-10): As indicated above, the State did not make any Indicator 4A Findings in FFY 2009 however; the state did issue three Indicator 4A FFY 2008 Findings of noncompliance and one of those remain uncorrected. The FFY 2011 review indicates the LEA has failed to correct the systemic noncompliance associated with the FFY 2008 Finding of noncompliance. Regarding the correction of the individual cases of noncompliance associated with the FFY 2008 Finding, the State did not identify any individual cases; it only identified systemic noncompliance. Also the State never made any individual Findings of noncompliance associated with the LEAs FFY 2009 uncorrected noncompliance.

	However, in relation to the FFY 2010 uncorrected noncompliance, the State did identify instances of individual noncompliance on January 31, 2012. See Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance/Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent) section above.
If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure compliance.	The state reviewed its improvement activities and determined that no changes needed to be made at this time.

Indicator 4B of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4B: Rates of suspension and expulsion:
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 Individualized Education Programs (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))

Measurement:
Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
In the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR, Indiana reported on Findings based on the analysis and review of FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data. However, the actual Findings were made on March 30, 2012, during the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The eight LEAS reported in the FFY 2010 APR as having Indicator 4B Significant Discrepancies due to inappropriate policies procedures and practices included seven LEAs that were issued new Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012. The eighth LEA designated with noncompliance was a continuation of a FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) Finding of noncompliance that was issued on May 11, 2010.

For the purpose of reporting in the current FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR Indiana is reporting on Findings that were issued on March 30, 2012, as described above, as well as the improvement activities completed in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

It is also important to note, as reported in the FFY 2010 APR, the Office of Special Education (OSEP) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC) began a review of Indiana's FFY 2009 Significant Discrepancy definition for Indicator 4B on July 19, 2011. Based upon this review, the State was required to change its 4B definition of Significant Discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. On January 5, 2012, the State received written notice from OSEP indicting that OSEP had reviewed the State's submission and determined that the revisions proposed in the September 15 and October 3, 2011 emails resolved their concerns by providing a race-neutral methodology. On January 13, 2012, the Indiana Special Advisory Council (SAC) reviewed and provided input on Indiana's revised Indicator 4B significant discrepancy definition. As directed by OSEP, the State changed its calculation methodology to assure compliance with 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State also elected to lower the risk ratio threshold from greater than 2.5 to greater than 2.0.

During the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) reporting period Indiana utilized its September 2010 enrollment count and data collected on Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2010-2011 due, November 1, 2011.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology:
As noted above, Indiana's revised definition identifies Significant Discrepancy of racial and ethnic groups (*American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American, Hispanic, and White*) in discipline as a risk ratio for a given racial/ethnic group that is greater than 2.0 for two consecutive years. Sample "n" size is set at a minimum of 10 students in a given population. A review of policies, procedures and practices is conducted on those Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) designated as having significant discrepancy to determine if the discrepancy is due to the LEA's failure to comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Indiana compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State when determining if significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)).

Beginning with the FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) APR, Indiana will report race and ethnicity data using the new seven, rather than the five, racial and ethnic categories (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, and two or more races).

Indicator 4B: Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY 2011 based on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data analysis.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (using SY 10-11 data)	Percent of districts reporting 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 will be 0%.

Actual target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) based on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Data Analysis:
Indiana's significant discrepancy definition requires an LEA to exceed the established 2.0 risk ratio threshold for two consecutive years. The State utilized the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data analysis when reporting significant discrepancy in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR.

4B(a). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

Year	Total Number of LEAs[18]	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent[19]
FFY 2011 (using SY 10-11 data)	**346**	**13**	**3.76%**

The data indicates 3.76% of the Indiana LEAs (13 out of 346 for the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)) had significant discrepancies, by race/ethnicity, in rates of suspension and expulsion during the reporting period.
288 LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the required "n" size of 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.

[18] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.
[19] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

4B(b). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and 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.

Year	Total Number of LEAs[20]	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and 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.	Percent
FFY 2011 (using SY 10-11 data)	**346**	8*	2.31%

**Seven of the eight LEAs were issued as new Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012. The eighth LEA had failed to correct a FFY 2009 Finding of noncompliance -- see below.*

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices completed in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and based on the SY 10-11 data analysis for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies:

a. The FFY 2011 (SY10-11) statistical analysis based the on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data analysis indicated 13 LEAs had a significant discrepancy in the rates for suspension and expulsion of students by race/ethnicity. The 13 LEAs were notified on December 9, 2011, of the significant discrepancies. This notification informed the LEA that it was required to review its policies, procedures and practices and to complete the *Indiana Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey* by December 23, 2011.

   The IDOE and its contracted agent reviewed and analyzed the LEAs' self-assessment surveys. Follow-up telephone calls and email exchanges were conducted with the LEAs to clarify information regarding their self-assessments, policies, procedures and practices, as needed. Based upon the review of each LEA's data, self-assessment and follow-up information, it was determined that two of the 13 LEAs' significant discrepancies were not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices. However, it was determined that it would be necessary to conduct individual file reviews on the 11 remaining LEAs with significant discrepancies to determine if appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22). The IDOE selected the files based upon a ten percent random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files for students with disabilities that were suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days during the FFY 2011 (SY 10-11).

b. The file review analysis indicated that the significant discrepancies in eight of the LEAs were due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices, and these eight LEAs were determined to be noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22).

c. Seven the eight LEAs that were determined to have significant discrepancies due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices were notified on March 30, 2012, of FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indicator 4B finding of noncompliance. (Upon further review, IDOE acknowledges that the findings are incorrectly denoted as FFY 2010, and should be denoted as FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Indicator 4B Findings of noncompliance. It is hereinafter correctly noted in the APR as "FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance.) The notification informed the LEA that it must:

   1) Correct the issue of noncompliance as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from the date of the notification of the finding pursuant to 20 USC § 1416(a)(3);

[20] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

2) Review and, if appropriate, 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; and
3) Correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student is no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA.

In addition, the LEAs identified with FFY 2011 (SY11-12) noncompliance are required to work with the IDOE and their assigned Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider to develop and implement a corrective action plan. Progress on this Indicator will be monitored through the general supervision component of the IDOE special education monitoring process.

The remaining LEA with FFY 2011 (SY 10-11) significant discrepancies due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices was notified on March 30, 2012, that it had failed to correct the FFY 2009 (SY09-10) Indicator 4B finding of noncompliance within one year of the State's notification (issued on May 11, 2010) and failed to subsequently correct the noncompliance. However, as noted below in the "Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance" section the LEA has subsequently corrected.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance issued March 30, 2012:

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) using FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data.	**7**
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**4**
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**3**

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**3**
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**3**

FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

The State determined that four of the seven LEAs that were issued FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012, had corrected their noncompliance within one year. The state verified that the four LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2011 Finding of Indicator 4B noncompliance and that the four LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2011 Findings for those students that were still within the LEA's jurisdiction.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Systemic Noncompliance**:**

  The State verified systemic correction of the four out of seven LEAs' FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEA's FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to

assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that four LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Individual Cases of Noncompliance**:**

The State verified that the four LEAs that had corrected their FFY 2011 Indicator 4B systemic noncompliance also corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2011 Finding of Indicator 4B noncompliance. The four LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEA's jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the State reviewed the students' IEPs and other related documentation and verified each individual instance had been corrected.

The three LEAs that failed to systemically correct their FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Finding also submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEA's jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the State reviewed the students' IEPs and other related documentation and verified each individual instance had been corrected in two of the three LEAs.

The one remaining LEA that failed to correct their FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, submitted evidence in October 2012 and January 2013 that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. On January 25, 2013 the state completed its review of the students current IEPs and other related documentation and verified each individual instance had been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
The State reviewed its improvement activities and determined that no changes were necessary at this time.

All three of the LEAs that failed to correct the FFY 2011 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance were required to establish a leadership team and attend the September 4, 2012, Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum. Each of the LEA leadership teams was provided with resources and materials to assist teams with their root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan (CAP). Each of the three LEAs was assigned to one of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers to provide them with ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data.

Discussion of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:

The State is not able to report on progress or slippage in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR because the March 30, 2012 Findings the State reported on in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR were actually FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Findings. Indiana looks forward to reporting progress or slippage utilizing the seven racial ethnic categories in the FFY 2012 APR due February 1, 2014.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: *(Note: As previously noted, the FFY 2010 APR indicated that the State had issued seven FFY 2010 Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012. However , these were actually FFY 2011 Findings of noncompliance.)*

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) using 2009-2010 data	**0**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**0**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**0**

5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

None

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):

1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP's June 2010 FFY 2009 APR response table for this Indicator	**1**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	**1**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has not verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings:
The state determined that the one remaining LEAs that was issued a FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance and failed to correct within one year has subsequently corrected the noncompliance.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Systemic Noncompliance**:**

  The state verified systemic correction of the LEAs FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance by reviewing the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/ Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEA had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Individual Cases of Noncompliance**:**

  The FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) Finding of noncompliance was based on identified systematic procedure and policy flaws that caused noncompliance in the LEA. Indiana's FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) significant discrepancy and monitoring process did not identify student specific cases of noncompliance, therefore there were no identified student specific cases to correct. However, as indicated above, the individual issues of noncompliance were specified in the FFY 2010 notification of continued non-compliance dated January 31, 2012.

  The state verified that the LEA had corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2010 notification of uncorrected Indicator 4B noncompliance. The LEA submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and verified each individual instance had been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
Not Applicable. There were no additional uncorrected FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):
Not Applicable. There were no remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive school-wide positive behavior support sites and increase educators' knowledge and understanding of how Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate and least restrictive environment placements.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive positive behavior supports. The project continues to work with emerging model sites to develop a state-of-the-art model of culturally responsive PBIS. The center collaborates closely with national leaders and a state advisory team to support a statewide PBIS network, including training and technical assistance. PBIS Indiana offered regional trainings throughout the state to scale up CR-PBIS across the state. This includes 25 schools working on Tier 1 supports and 26 schools working on Tier 2 supports. In addition, PBIS Indiana continues to work in the 4 assigned intensive districts providing technical assistance and support.
Continue to gather data on significant discrepancy of racial and ethnic groups in special education and disseminate to stakeholders through a variety of formats, including the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) website.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The State has continued to gather disproportionality data. The statewide data is available to anyone who visits the Equity Project website at: http://ceep.indiana.edu/equitydata. In addition, each LEA received their individual passwords on December 5, 2012 which gives them access to their LEA specific data. Information was disseminated on how to access and interpret the disproportionality data during the LEA Technical Assistance Forum on Disproportionality on September 4, 2012, the fall Indiana Council Of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) on September 28, 2012, DOE local/regional disproportionality trainings on July 23, 24 and 25, 2012 and Policy Briefs.
Provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the State to improve teaching and learning via the six IRN centers whose areas of focus are: • Autism; • Effective assessment and instruction; • Effective evaluations; • Effective and compliant IEPs; • Positive behavior supports; and, • Transition to adulthood. In additional statewide support DOE will be provide on: • Parent training and information; • Assistive and accessible technologies; and,	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	Information regarding the IRN centers a can be found at: http://www.irn.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=Centers The following IRN centers are providing technical assistance related to disproportionality issues: PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center The Indiana University Equity Project at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) in collaboration with the Center for Education and Lifelong Learning at the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community (IIDC) is the IRN center whose focus is 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. The center is working on the following activities: • Development of an expanded RTI-based model of PBIS that addresses issues of culture and contributes to improved outcomes in achievement,

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
• Training for teachers of students who are deaf, blind or have low vision.		graduation, and LRE; • Development of six model demonstration sites committed to the full implementation of the PBIS Indiana framework. This work includes culturally responsive training at Tier 1, 2, and 3; • Working with sites assigned by the IDOE to address identified insufficiencies through the implementation of the PBS Indiana framework; • Working with schools partially implementing PBIS, providing professional development and technical assistance as needed to move schools at any level of implementation to more complete implementation; • Conducting a survey statewide to assess the level of implementation in schools across the state; • Increasing capacity by building the knowledge base; and, • Development of a fully functioning and sustainable network of culturally responsive PBIS in Indiana. The center has developed an extensive list of tools that include web-based modules, publications and other resources on: • Culturally responsive practices; • Disproportionality; • Leadership teams; and, • PBIS frameworks. Effective Evaluation Resource Center (EERC) The EERC provides statewide professional development as well as targeted technical assistance to LEAs. The EERC focuses on increasing Indiana educators' skills and practices to ensure a) targeted and high quality interventions and strategies for struggling students and b) the use of appropriate special education evaluation procedures and eligibility guidelines for all students. The EERC provides assistance to LEAs in the correction of noncompliance and implementation of systemic changes to prevent future noncompliance. The EERC provided targeted technical assistance and statewide professional development related to appropriate identification practices and outcomes. This included: d) Coordination of the Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum, attended by leadership teams from 15 districts with findings for Indicator 4, 9, and/or 10. Resources and materials were developed to assist teams with root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan. EERC is providing ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		e) Onsite technical assistance to LEA district leadership team including review and revision of procedures and practices, text-based discussions, and facilitation of leadership teams and disproportionality committees. f) Development of written and online resources for use by targeted LEAs and schools statewide. Resources focused on topics such as second language learners, assessment of English language learners, culturally responsive practices, and evidence-based behavior interventions. HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center The HANDS in Autism® Interdisciplinary Training & Resource Center provides unique learning opportunities designed to integrate and understand autism and related developmental disabilities through hands-on and coaching experiences. Training and/or consultation opportunities are offered throughout the State and are customized to meet the needs of a particular site determined based on a needs assessment of participants, schools, or the district, verbal feedback, historical review of trainings, and/or verbal discussion with stakeholders requesting such trainings and/or consultation. Such trainings are provided by a multidisciplinary HANDS training team who represent a combination of professionals from the fields of special education, general education, behavioral analysis, school psychology, public health, and clinical psychology. Such a broad range of experience allows us work with different populations and groups and is illustrative of the necessary collaboration involved with successful Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (CRSWPBS) and multidisciplinary teams. Trainings are based upon evidence-based practices in autism, as reported by the National Standards Project and National Autism Center, and in line with the proactive and positive behavioral plans promoted within CRSWPBS. These foundational components (i.e., proactive and positive behavioral plans) are a natural tie to the HANDS training curriculum and evidence based practices purported by the aforementioned report. Another hands-on training opportunity is offered through Summer Training, a week-long intensive training for school personnel that combines didactic training and hands-on experience in the HANDS classroom. In addition to hands-on training and consultations, HANDS in Autism® offers a growing depository of other learning opportunities:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		- *Workshops for professionals and caregivers:* a series of workshops based on the most popular topics that may include but not limited to creation of visuals supports for specific strategies, Q&A for parents, strategy training, etc. Offered live and online. - *eLearning*: self-paced interactive tutorials that range from general information about autism to the use of specific strategies. Upon successful completion of a tutorial and final quiz, participants will get a certificate of completion that could be used towards PGP. - *Web-, podcasts, and videos:* archived webinars on a range of topics. Certificate of completion is available for select options. Videos range from general information about autism to strategy video modeling. - *Training Toolkits:* resource toolkits that range from single strategy training to a setting-specific range of strategies training that could be used to train peers, parents, and colleagues. - *Manuals*: Large publications that offer helpful information and strategies for specific populations (e.g., caregivers of individuals with autism, etc). - *Individual publications:* handouts that range from general information about the disorders to specific strategy-based information, templates for academic and non-academic activities, functional skills training, etc. Materials in Spanish are also available. - *Collaboration with local professionals and families* through the HANDS-initiated Local Community Cadres to meet needs of specific communities in training, material dissemination, and resource development. IN*SOURCE Parent Support Volunteers (PSV): IN*SOURCE continued to provide ongoing activities throughout the state to help support a network of one hundred and seventy (170) PSVs. IN*SOURCE has maintained this volunteer network for thirty-two (32) years. This program has successfully supported many thousands of parents of children with disabilities statewide, using a parent to parent service delivery mode. IN*SOURCE provided information and ongoing training and support to the PSVs via its statewide network of paid staff of Regional Program Specialist (RPS). Individual support to parent volunteers is available on an "as needed" basis and covers many different topics or issues including suspensions and expulsions of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP). During this seventeen month period, this

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		parent volunteer statewide network provided training and assistance to nine hundred and fifty-six (956) families and other contacts statewide. This training and assistance included support to families concerning special education eligibility, eligibility categories and expulsion & suspension of students with IEPs. RPS: IN*SOURCE continued the maintenance of twenty-two (22) regional offices to insure an appropriate level of support for parents and educators in their communities. Statewide support to families and educators reflected in this activity are generally provided on an individual basis, and may include assistance provided by email, telephone or on a face to face basis. RPS in the regional offices assistance to families covered a range of topics concerning the education of students with disabilities. During this seventeen month period, IN*SOURCEs RPS provided assistance to sixteen thousand, three hundred and thirty-six (16,336) families and other contacts statewide. From this number of total contacts, three hundred and thirty-eight (338) contacts included information and support to families concerning suspension and expulsion. Statewide: IN*SOURCE staff also continued its support to parents of children with disabilities and educators statewide by providing both live and online training opportunities. These training programs cover a variety of topics including the special education processes, eligibility, IEPs, transition to adult life, and suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs. During this time period, IN*SOURCE staff conducted four hundred and ten (410) live trainings across the state, reaching seven thousand, five hundred and sixty-eight (7,568) participants. IN*SOURCE also reached three thousand and seventy-eight (3,078) participants through its online library of special education presentations. PATINS Project / ICAM The Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for all Students Project (PATINS Project) state-wide technical assistance network for the provision of assistive/accessible technology supports to assist Indiana's local educational agencies. As a sole source provider for the Indiana Department of Administration and the Indiana Department of Education, the PATINS Project works with local educational agencies to create, locate, and acquire flexible and accessible curricular materials and utilize technology tools that will support students with disabilities and reduce the existing barriers to learning in the classroom. By addressing learner barriers in the classroom through effective and accessible technologies, materials and instruction, the project provides resources (assistive technologies and training)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		to local educational agencies to develop compensatory strategies and access to tools to reduce the effects of student's disabilities and thereby allowing students to focus their ability on the specific demands of academic tasks and successfully demonstrate acceptable behaviours. The PATINS Project works with schools to reduce potential triggers of undesirable behaviour through the use of assistive technology and effective instruction by: • Utilizing specific assistive technology tools to monitor behaviour during assigned classroom tasks; • Utilizing strategies and assistive technology tools to self-regulate behaviour during academic task performance; • Accessing the curriculum in multiple, flexible and engaging ways • Maintaining a Refurbished Computer program, which supplies students with access who may not have computer access otherwise. • Maintaining and regularly updating an online set of video, text and audio resources available to LEA staff 24/7, • Maintaining a state-wide repository and delivery system of accessible instructional materials and, • Utilizing assistive technology to help students manage behaviours associated with social components of classroom activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012(if applicable):
There are no changes in the proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines or resources for FFY 2012.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010 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	Please see the section entitled "Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance" above.

(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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	
If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	The State reviewed its improvement activities and determined that no changes were necessary at this time.
The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	Please see the section entitled "Verification of Correction of Reminding FFY 2009 Findings" above.

Indicator 5 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged 6 through 21 served:
- **A.** Inside the general education class 80% or more of the day;
- **B.** Inside the general education 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))

Measurement:
- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the general education class 80% or more of the day) ÷ (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] x 100
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the general education class less than 40% of the day) ÷ (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPS) x 100
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placements) ÷ (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] x 100

Overview of the Indicator:
For the December 1 child count during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), every Local Educational Agency (LEA) was responsible for entering placement data for all students within each LEA into the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) staff disaggregated the data from FFY 2011 to analyze the distribution of students by setting. Data reported for this Indicator is the same data reported in Indiana's 618 Table 3 submissions on February 1, 2012.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	A. The percent of students with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day will be equal to or greater than 60.42%. B. The percent of students with disabilities inside the regular class less than 40% of the instructional day is equal to or less than 15.25%. C. The percent of students with disabilities served in either public/private separate schools or in residential placements is equal to or less than 1.17%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Breakdown and Calculation of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) LRE by Setting		
LRE Category	**FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)[21]**	
Inside the general education class 80% of more of the day **(5A)**	101,134	**69.28%**
Inside the general education class less than 40% of the day **(5B)**	17,554	**12.03%**
Inside separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/ hospital placements **(5C)[22]**	3,296	**2.26%**
• Separate School	1,619	
• Homebound/Hospital	1,034	
• Residential	643	

Indiana met its target for Indicators 5A and 5B, but did not meet its target for Indicator 5C. See the table above for the breakdown and calculation of the distribution of students aged 6-21 with IEPs by setting.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

FFY	Indicator 5A Percentage	Indicator 5A Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	69.28%	≥ 60.42%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	67.86%	≥ 60.41%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	64.89%	≥ 60.40%

The IDOE met its target of ≥ 60.40% for Indicator 5 in FFY 2011. Indiana reports 69.28% for Indicator 5A for FFY 2011, which represents progress of 1.42% from the score of 67.86% in FFY 2010.

FFY	Indicator 5B Percentage	Indicator 5BTarget
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	12.03%	≤ 15.25%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	12.60%	≤ 15.26%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	12.51%	≤ 15.27%

Indiana reports 12.03% for Indicator 5B for FFY 2010, which represents progress of .57% from the score of 12.60% in FFY 2010.

FFY	Indicator 5C Percentage	Indicator 5CTarget
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	2.26%	≤ 1.17%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	2.25%	≤ 1.18%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	2.46%	≤ 1.19%

[21] These percentages do not include those students in the general education setting 40% to 79% of the day. This accounts for the total percentage not totaling to 100%.
[22] The totals for 5C include the sum of Separate School, Homebound/Hospital and Residential

The IDOE reports 2.26% for Indicator 5C for FFY 2011. The target was not met for Indicator 5C, and this also represents slippage of .01% from the score 2.25% in FFY 2010.

Indiana has begun to analyze data for Indicator 5C in comparison to Indicator 4A to determine if the increased focus on suspensions and expulsions has resulted in more students being placed in alternative settings or homebound placements. Data analysis will continue regarding the slippage and lack of meeting the target for Indicator 5C.

The IDOE attributes its overall the progress in Indicator 5 to an increased focus in the State on appropriate (Least Restrictive Environment) LRE placements. The IDOE began making onsite visits to the lowest performing LEAs on Indicator 5 in FFY 2009 and increased the number of visits in FFY 2011. The IDOE continues monitoring LRE in order to ensure improvement from year to year. From the inception of the onsite LRE monitoring program in FFY 2009, the IDOE has noted that the amount of time students spend in the general education setting has continued to rise.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	**9**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**7**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**2**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**2**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**2**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):
For FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indiana issued 9 findings under Indicator 5. Of the 9 findings that were issued, 7 were verified as having corrected the noncompliance within one year of the issuance of the finding. In order to verify correction, IEPs that were initially determined to be out of compliance for items relating to LRE were reviewed and each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected. In addition, the LEA's policies, procedures, practices as well as FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) child count data were reviewed to ensure that regulatory requirements were being met. To satisfy that the systemic correction of noncompliance had occurred, a random sample of the LEA's IEPs were harvested from the State's electronic IEP tool and evaluated for areas related to LRE. In 7 out of the 9 LEAs, this evaluation showed that each LEA was correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements at 100%.

For the other 2 LEAs, the random sample of IEPs did not show 100% compliance, thus the findings remained past the one year of correction. For these LEAs IEPs that were determined to be out of compliance for items relating to LRE were reviewed and each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected. The SEA has since conducted follow up conferences and onsite verification visits for these LEAs and it was found that professional development activities as well as other procedural changes had been conducted but had not yet been fully implemented and therefore was not reflected within IEPs evaluated. When new samples of IEPs

were evaluated and updated data was analyzed, it was determined that the 2 LEAs were implementing all regulatory requirements at 100% and were subsequently able to be released from the Indicator 5 finding.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2010 was Not Corrected:
All FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) findings issued for indicator 5 were verified as corrected.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Support training and information sharing sessions conducted by other public or private agencies on LRE for families and school/agency personnel.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA 2004 grantee and parent advocacy group, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), conducted a variety of presentations and workshops across the State. The training sessions often focused on helping parents and educators understand the special education process and concepts. The training events were conducted in collaboration with other agencies such as the IDOE, Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC), About Special Kids (ASK), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) and many LEAs from across the state. IN*SOURCE maintains an agency website for the distribution of help for parents. The online resources provided parents easy access to important information and provided a forum to exchange ideas and information with other parents. In addition to the website and social networking resource, IN*SOURCE also published and distributed an agency newsletter to parents and educators across the State via mail and e-mail. Information can be obtained regarding IN*SOURCE by going to http://www.insource.org/ During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA grantee the Effective and Compliant IEP Resource Center maintained an agency website for the distribution of help for parents, families, and educators around the topic of LRE. The online resources provided parents, families, and educators an easy access to important information surrounding LRE, how to write a compliant IEP with the required components for LRE as well as information pertaining to case conferences. Information on the IEP Resource Center webpage can be found at: http://www.indianaieprc.org/joomla
Conduct parent/family support in LRE through training and material dissemination.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	IN*SOURCE participated in the onsite monitoring process for LRE in order to lead parent forums that allow the IDOE to gather information pertaining to the onsite monitoring visit. An IN*SOURCE employee lead each parent forum and provided information and support to families regarding LRE.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Improvement Grants focusing on LRE	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	OSE accepted proposals from LEAs regarding a Special Education Improvement Award. Each LEA was invited to submit a proposal to the OSE highlighting how they would use a $70,000.00 award to improve upon their current services for students with disabilities, while upholding the vision of the Indiana Department of Education. The OSE only accepted proposals that highlighted specific activities, as outlined in IDEA CFR 300.704(4). One option the LEAs could choose was to use the grant for support and direct services, including technical assistance, personnel preparation, and professional development and training limited to the subjects of LRE and the implementation of Common Core State Standards. 98 LEAs were awarded this grant and utilized this opportunity for increased technical assistance on the topic of LRE.
Statewide Inclusion Conference	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA 2004 grantee the Effective and Compliant IEP Resource Center held the first statewide conference on inclusive education, February 29 2012 – March 2, 2012. The conference began with a one day pre-conference session on progress monitoring followed by two days filled with professional development opportunities in inclusive practices and strategies. Twenty national and state experts in special education presented 34 concurrent and general sessions on topics including diverse learners in general education classrooms, co-teaching, differentiation of instruction and assessment, and goal writing. More than 450 Indiana general and special educators, administrators, support service personnel, parents, and college students were in attendance.
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)
Indicator 5 data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) reflects that the State improved for 5A, 5B. Indiana has revised its improvement activities to address the slippage for Indicator 5C.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.	No response required.

Indicator 6 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with Individualized Education Programs (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))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
For the December 1 child count during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), every Local Educational Agency (LEA) was responsible for entering placement data for all students within each LEA into the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) staff disaggregated the data from FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) to analyze the distribution of students by setting. Data reported for this Indicator is the same data reported in Indiana's 618 Table 3 submissions on February 1, 2012.

For the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) submission of the State Performance Plan (SPP)/APR, due February 15, 2013, Indiana has established FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) baseline data for Indicator 6 as well as targets for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13). This information is available in the Indicator 6 section of Indiana's SPP.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 11-12)	Not applicable

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Not applicable.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Not applicable.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Support training and information sharing sessions conducted by other public or private agencies on LRE for families and school/agency personnel.	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA grantee and parent advocacy group, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), conducted a variety of presentations and workshops across the State. The training sessions often focused on helping parents and educators understand the special education process and concepts. The training events were conducted in collaboration with other agencies such as the IDOE, Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC), About Special Kids (ASK), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) and many LEAs from across the state. IN*SOURCE maintains an agency website for the distribution of help for parents. The online resources provided parents easy access to important information and provided a forum to exchange ideas and information with other parents. In addition to the website and social networking resource, IN*SOURCE also published and distributed an agency newsletter to parents and educators across the State via mail and e-mail. Information can be obtained regarding IN*SOURCE by going to *http://www.insource.org* During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA grantee the Effective and Compliant IEP Resource Center maintained an agency website for the distribution of help for parents, families, and educators around the topic of LRE. The online resources provided parents, families, and educators an easy access to important information surrounding LRE, how to write a compliant IEP with the required components for LRE as well as information pertaining to case conferences. Information on the IEP Resource Center webpage can be found at: http://www.indianaieprc.org/joomla
Conduct parent/family support in LRE through training and material dissemination.	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	IN*SOURCE participated in the onsite monitoring process for LRE in order to lead parent forums that allow the IDOE to gather information pertaining to the onsite monitoring visit. An IN*SOURCE employee lead each parent forum and provided information and support to families regarding LRE.

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Statewide Inclusion Conference	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the IDEA 2004 grantee the Effective and Compliant IEP Resource Center held the first statewide conference on inclusive education, February 29 – March2, 2012. The conference began with a one day pre-conference session on progress monitoring followed by two days filled with professional development opportunities in inclusive practices and strategies. Twenty national and state experts in special education presented 34 concurrent and general sessions on topics including diverse learners in general education classrooms, co-teaching, differentiation of instruction and assessment, and goal writing. More than 450 Indiana general and special educators, administrators, support service personnel, parents, and college students were in attendance.
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
Indiana will review data for Indicator 6 for the FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) February 1, 2014 submission of the APR and will determine possible revisions to targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources at that time.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.	See Indicator 6 section of Indiana's SPP.

Indicator 7 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with Individualized Education Programs (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)
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

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

Measurement:

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Targets and Actual Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2011 (2011-12):

Summary Statements[23]	Actual FFY 2010 (% and # children)	Actual FFY 2011 (% and # children)	Target FFY 2011 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)			
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d**	64.2% (1896)	**78.3%** (1519)	53.5%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. **Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e**	20.4% (657)	**20.1%** (424)	42%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)			
1 Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d**	72.6% (2217)	**77.7%** (1568)	66.5%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. **Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e**	15.4% (494)	**13.3%** (280)	49%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs			
1 Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. **Formula: c+d/ a+b+c+d**	74.5% (2254)	**80.0%** (1597)	78%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. **Formula: d+e/ a+b+c+d+e**	16.9% (544)	**13.9%** (293)	65.5%

[23] The IDOE used the Early Childhood Outcome's Center (ECO) I-7 tool to calculate each summary statement, located here: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/pages/fed_req.cfm#TargetSetting

Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY 2011:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	110	5.2%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	311	14.8%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1260	59.9%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	259	12.3%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	165	7.8%
Total	**N= 2105**	**100%**

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	40	1.9%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	412	19.6%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1373	65.2%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	194	9.2%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	86	4.1%
Total	**N= 2105**	**100%**

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning	59	2.8%
b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	340	16.2%
c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1413	67.1%
d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	184	8.7%
e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	109	5.2%
Total	**N= 2105**	**100%**

Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:
From August 2004 until August 2008, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) utilized the Indiana Standards Tools for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)[24] to measure and monitor individual child progress and to report on the three early childhood outcomes. Beginning with the spring of FFY 2008 (SY 08-09), the

[24] Details regarding the criteria for us of the ISTAR assessment in lieu of ISTEP+ can be accessed at: http://www2.doe.in.gov/achievement/assessment/istar

instrument was improved and standardized based on the findings of studies conducted through a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG). The new version was named the Indiana Standard Tool for

The ISTAR-KR scoring rubric and cut scores were established by a standard setting task force comprised of a diverse range of stakeholders including parents, professionals from First Steps, Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), health care providers and child development specialists. Beginning with the new ISTAR-KR, the three outcome areas are featured rather than the discipline and domain areas of the previous early childhood assessment. ISTAR-KR utilizes an improved method for capturing the statistical construct of achievement with peers. Based on a student's birth data, a score that is equal to or above this expected score would be considered evidence of achievement at a level that is "comparable to same age peers". The new ISTAR-KR represents a system based on rigorous high standards for student achievement.

In FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indiana met with the State Advisory Council (SAC) and members of Indiana Council Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) to establish new baselines, targets and improvement activities for Indicator 7. The consensus was that these elements were accurately reflective of the data from students who took the entrance and exit assessment exclusively in ISTAR-KR at this time. Therefore baselines, targets and improvement activities will remain the same during the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). In FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), it was determined that at this time baselines will not change because they reflect cut scores based on same-aged-peer skill level. Targets can change and should/can be evaluated but as Indiana had yet to meet current targets the State Advisory Council (SAC) and members of the Indiana Council Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) concluded that these targets were still reasonable and effective. Indiana will continue to review and analyze the results from ISTAR-KR in the following reporting, FFY 2012 (SY 12-13, and discuss the possible establishment of new baseline data, targets and improvement activities based on two years of trend data at that time.

Discussion of Summary Statements and a-e Progress Data for FFY 2011:
Outcome A exceeded the target for Summary Statement 1 by 24.8% and missed the target for Summary Statement 2 by 21.9%. Outcome B exceeded the target for Summary Statement 1 by 11.2% and missed the target for Summary Statement 2 by 35.7%. Outcome C exceeded the target for Summary Statement 1 by 2.0% and missed the target for Summary Statement 2 by 51.6%. Indiana reported all student entrance and exit assessments that were reported using ISTAR-KR for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

The 'a' through 'e' progress data for all three outcomes shows a pattern where the majority of students fall into categories 'b' through 'e' showing improvement or maintenance of age appropriate skills. The State's percentages for 'a' through 'e' were to be expected based on the fact that the majority of the students that were assessed utilizing ISTAR-KR improved age appropriate skills. For Outcome A, 94.8% of students assessed with ISTAR-KR improved functioning or maintained functioning of age appropriate skills. For Outcome B, 98.1% of students assessed with ISTAR-KR improved functioning or maintained functioning of age appropriate skills. For Outcome C, 97.2% of students assessed with ISTAR-KR improved functioning or maintained functioning of age appropriate skills.

In FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) for Outcome A, Indiana shows progress of 14.1% for Summary Statement 1 and slippage of .3% for Summary Statement 2. For Outcome B, Indiana shows progress of 5.1% for Summary Statement 1 and slippage of 2.1% for Summary Statement 2. For Outcome C, Indiana shows progress of 5.5% for Summary Statement 1 and slippage 3% for Summary Statement 2. Although Indiana shows slippage for Summary Statement 2, analysis of the data shows that students assessed by ISTAR-KR are making substantial gains despite not functioning within age expectations by the time they exit the program. This shows that interventions and supports are effective in improving student functioning.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Provide child progress data to LEAs by LEA, reported disability and by the length of time in service.	FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE presented at the Early Childhood Conference for state Early Childhood directors so that LEAs know how to access and utilize their data concerning this Indicator. Data is analyzed by the Office of Special Education and then distributed to each LEA upon request.
The IDOE's Departments of Assessment and Special Education will provide regional training opportunities, video modules, FAQ's, newsletters, conferences, onsite training when requested, reference materials and ISTAR-KR troubleshooting.	FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE's Office of Student Assessment employs specialists trained to provide and facilitate the training of ISTAR-KR. The specialists continue to develop resources for the continuing education of individuals using the ISTAR-KR. The specialists also work with the IDOE's monitoring team in order to share performance data with LEAs and to monitor progress on the Indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Indicator 7 data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) represents missed targets and slippage in several areas; however, as noted above, the majority of students assessed through ISTAR-KR have shown substantial growth.

In FFY 2012 (SY 12-13), Indiana evaluated the ISTAR-KR data as soon as it was available and it was determined that the targets for Summary Statement 2 for all three Outcomes will be reviewed. Because the targets were set while utilizing two forms of assessment, Indiana has determined through data analysis that baseline data and targets will need to be reviewed with stakeholder input for FFY 2012 using the two years of trend data collected solely through ISTAR-KR.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from Response Table	Indiana's Response
The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.	Indiana has included the section entitled "Target Data and Actual Target Data for FFY 2010" above.

Indicator 8 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) ÷ (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] x 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
Whereas once it was sufficient for States to simply conduct a survey to gauge "parent satisfaction," this is no longer the case. Indicator 8 requires that States initiate a process that utilizes contemporary survey methodology to systematically collect, analyze, and report data selected from a representative sample. The primary aim of this process is to assess the extent to which "schools" (e.g., special and general educators and administrators) have facilitated the involvement of parents in their child's educational program (e.g., parent conferences, IEP meetings).

In FFY 2009 the IDOE used the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) survey with state specific questions added and this survey has been deemed a valid and reliable instrument for the purposes of this Indicator. For the complete survey, revised in FFY 2010, please see Attachment 8.1 located immediately following this Indicator.

WestEd conducted the FFY 2011 Parent Survey for the IDOE to help the State of Indiana generate improvement activities to ensure that parents are involved in the planning and implementation of their child's special education program. Overall, the project involved three general phases of activity. The first phase of the project revolved around the initial project planning and design activities. The second phase of involved the administration of the parent survey to parents throughout the state, and the third phase of the project centered on the data analysis and report generation activities.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 11-12)	42.6% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12): [25]

Parent Involvement	
Parents who report that the school facilitated parent involvement	7,602
Parents surveyed	10,753
Percent	**70.7%**

The original scope of work called for WestEd to implement the Office of Special Education Program (OSEP) approved sampling plan for the Indicator 8 parent survey as described in the SPP to obtain a representative sample of the parents or caregivers of children receiving special education services in Indiana. The original sampling plan used a two-fold stratified sampling technique: stratification by LEA category (i.e., school corporations/charter schools and state run schools) and LEA enrollment. By use of the two-fold stratification method, Indiana's sampling process would have allowed the State to select a sample that was representative of the age, gender, race/ethnicity, disability category and community of its students with IEP's. According to the SPP, there was a total of 337 LEAs in Indiana: 293 School Corporations, 40 Charter Schools and 4 State-operated Schools. One fourth of these (n = 85) were to have been sampled according to the original 2009-2010 parent survey research design.

After the selection of the 85 LEAs for 2009-2010 data collection, a second stage of sampling would have selected the eligible parents of students with disabilities. WestEd would have been provided with the decision rules regarding the process for selecting a student(s) whose parents were to be asked to complete the survey. The resultant sample would have included 383 parents, based on a desired confidence interval of 95% and a confidence level of + / – 5%.

For a number of reasons, the sampling plan for the 2009-2010 parent survey was modified during the planning and design activities to include all parents throughout the state for a total of approximately 171,500 parents. The 2010-2011 Parent Survey and 2011-2012 Parent Survey were similarly administered to all parents throughout the state (see Attachment 8.1 for a copy of the survey).

The primary strategy most States have elected to meet reporting requirements related to Indicator 8 has been to utilize the series of parent involvement surveys developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The NCSEAM Family Survey protocol for special education was constructed around four broad domains: school efforts to partner with parents, quality of services, parent participation, and impact of special education services on your family. The first domain – school efforts to partner with parents – addresses the Part B Indicator #8 reporting requirement. Available in multiple languages and formats, the NCSEAM parent involvement questionnaire items were developed using scientifically-based metric strategies that can be adapted to meet the specific needs of States.

Prior to the start of the 2009-2010 survey project, IDOE had developed a questionnaire using the NCSEAM questions, and this questionnaire was used again for the 2009-2010 survey as a means of maintaining continuity with previous data collection efforts. In general, the questionnaire asked parents to rate the extent to which they agree/disagree with a series of 31 statements (using a scale of 1= Strongly Disagree / 2=Disagree / 3=Neutral / 4=Agree / 5=Strongly Agree) pertaining to your experience and your child's experience with special education throughout the 2009-2010 academic year. Parents were also asked to respond to a number of demographic questions: child's primary exceptionality/disability, child's race/ethnicity, child's school, child's age in years, and child's grade level. The questionnaire contained one open-ended question to which parents could add any additional comments they had.

The questionnaire used for the 2010-2011 Parent Survey was modified slightly to better meet the information-making needs of IDOE. More specifically, the response options for 11 of the 31 statements were changed to a "yes/no" format, and the five-point rating scale for the remaining statements was changed to a

[25] The results of this survey have been disaggregated and are publicly posted on the following website: http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-8-parent-involvement.

four-point scale (1= Strongly Disagree / 2=Disagree / 3=Agree / 4=Strongly Agree). The 2010-2011 questionnaire was used again for the 2011-2012 Parent Survey.

Overall, a total of 171,931 survey packets were distributed to parents whose children received special education services throughout the state during the 2011-2012 academic year. A total of 10,753 parents returned a usable questionnaire at an overall response rate of 6.3%.

More specifically, 2,446 surveys were completed via the web-based survey, and 8,307 surveys were completed via the paper questionnaire supplied in the original survey packet. A detailed breakdown of the 2011-2012 survey response rates by both Special Education District and School Corporation is available in Appendices G and H.

The 2011-2012 Parent Survey asked parents to respond to eleven "yes/no" questions, and to rate the extent to which they agree/disagree with a series of 20 statements (using a scale of 1= Strongly Disagree / 2=Disagree / 3=Agree / 4=Strongly Agree) pertaining to your experience and your child's experience with special education throughout the 2011-2012 academic year.

Roughly 70% of parents on average responded favorably to the 11 "yes/no" questions. In general, parents were the most likely to report that they had discussed options concerning services in the Least Restrictive Environment (93%), received reports about my child's progress toward goals as outlined in his or her Individualized Education Program (92%) and discussed and planned for accommodations and modifications that their child would need (91%). On the other hand, parents were the least likely to report that they had attended training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families (30%), discussed extended school year options (52%), and been given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities (55%).

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011(SY 11-12): [26]

Parent Involvement	
Parents who report that the school facilitated parent involvement	7,602
Parents surveyed	10,753
Percent	**70.7%**

In the FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) APR, Indiana received 91 responses to the parent survey from a sample group of Indiana LEAs. In the FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) APR, Indiana received 12,948 valid responses to the parent survey. In the reporting year FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR, Indiana received a total of 12,060 usable questionnaires. In the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR, Indiana received a total of 10,753 usable questionnaires. This shows a slippage in the response rate of 1,307. Despite the slippage in response rate, the percentage of parents reporting that the school facilitated parent involvement has risen 1.1% from 69.6% in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) to 70.7% in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). Despite progress in school facilitated parent involvement, the IDOE is evaluating improvement activities to elicit a better response rate in the future.

[26] The results of this survey have been disaggregated and are publicly posted on the following website: http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-8-parent-involvement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
a. Continue funding for IN*SOURCE and ASK b. Increase number of returned parent surveys c. Notify planning districts of results of parent surveys	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	a. According to the FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) APR, the parent population has been hard to reach and get to respond to parent feedback mechanisms. In order to obtain an acceptable response rate and representative sample of respondents, WestEd and the IDOE enlisted the help of INSOURCE, ASK, CEL, PIRCs and PRC. In addition, the Director of Special Education wrote an in-depth article on the parent survey for the INSOURCE newsletter to enhance parent awareness and response rates for the survey and presented to the INSOURCE advocates so that advocates could inform parents about the survey as well. An IDOE specialist also participated in a recorded interview with the ARC of Indiana to raise awareness regarding the survey. b. To further support an improved response rate, WestEd and the IDOE provided multiple response mechanisms for respondents. Parents were able to respond to a web-based survey or via a paper survey. c. The results of the parent surveys were publicly posted on the IDOE's website at the following address: http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-8-parent-involvement.
Analyze survey results for trends regarding consistently low-scoring and high-scoring areas of parent involvement.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Data is disaggregated to show consistently low-scoring and high-scoring areas so that LEAs can utilize this information to improve where parents report seeing the most need. http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-8-parent-involvement.
Training and technical assistance to strengthen family, school, and community partnerships will be provided to local educational agencies as a means to increase student achievement and parental involvement.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	IN*SOURCE conducted a variety of presentations and workshops across the state. The training sessions often focused on helping parents and educators understand the special education process. Individual assistance was also an important part of the support provided to families in pursuit of assistance for their children with disabilities. This assistance and consultation was provided through meetings, phone calls, email and letters. IN*SOURCE staff provided individual assistance and consultation. IN*SOURCE accompanies OSE staff on Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) visits to conduct parent forums. Time during these forums is dedicated to explaining the parent survey process in an effort to boaster
Train parents through Indiana's Academy for Parent Leadership and other parent organizations throughout Indiana to be a part of training and technical assistance to statewide initiatives.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Parents continue to be trained through Indiana's Academy for Parent Leadership by the Indiana Parent Information and Resource Center (PIRC). Every academy session focused on a different topic area, including special education overview; gaining knowledge about Indiana's standards and assessments; examining parental rights and responsibilities under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and Indiana Public Law 221; and developing effective communication and group facilitation skills. In addition, each participant collaborated with his or her school community to create and implement a leadership project using the school's data with the potential to increase parent involvement and support student achievement.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Provide information sessions to increase awareness of statewide initiatives and effective educational practices among families and communities.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE and the Indiana PIRC collaborated on a resource guide called A Parent's Guide to Understanding IDEA 2004: An Overview of Topic Areas. This guide was distributed throughout FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
Indiana has met targets set for Indicator 8 for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and therefore has no revisions to its targets, timelines, or resources for this Indicator at this time. However, two improvement activities have been completed and removed from this section.

Additional Information Required by OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No response required.

Attachment 8.1

Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Parent Survey 2010-2011

This is a survey for parents of students receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each statement below, please select one response choice by placing an ☒ in the appropriate box for each question. In responding to each statement, think about your experience and your child's experience with special education throughout the past academic year **(2010-2011)**. If you would like to complete the survey online please go to http://surveys.wested.org/s3/inps. **When prompted for the Survey Security Code, type the number located in the upper right corner of this survey**. Thank you.

Question	Yes	No
1) At the Case Conference Committee meeting, we discussed options concerning services in the Least Restrictive Environment.	❒	❒
2) At the Case Conference Committee meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments (ISTEP, ISTAR).	❒	❒
3) At the Case Conference Committee meeting, we discussed and planned for accommodations and modifications that my child would need (i.e. tests read aloud, preferential seating, scribe, strategies to deal with behavior).	❒	❒
4) Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the general classroom.	❒	❒
5) At the Case Conference Committee meeting, we discussed extended school year options.	❒	❒
6) I receive reports about my child's progress toward goals as outlined in his or her Individualized Education Program.	❒	❒
7) The school explains what options I have if an issue cannot be resolved in a Case Conference Committee meeting.	❒	❒
8) The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in transitions.	❒	❒
9) I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	❒	❒
10) I participate in school sponsored activities.	❒	❒
11) I attend training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families.	❒	❒

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12) I am treated like an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's special education needs and goals.	❒	❒	❒	❒
13) When scheduling Case Conference Committee meeting, consideration was given to my availability.	❒	❒	❒	❒
14) Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards (the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents).	❒	❒	❒	❒
15) General education personnel make accommodations and modifications as indicated on my child's Individualized Education Program.	❒	❒	❒	❒
16) Special education personnel make accommodations and modifications as	❒	❒	❒	❒

indicated on my child's Individualized Education Program.				
17) All staff understands my child's needs and their role in implementing my child's Individualized Education Program.	❒	❒	❒	❒
18) My child receives all the supports and services documented in his or her Individualized Education Program.	❒	❒	❒	❒
19) My child's Individualized Education Program tells how progress towards goals will be measured.	❒	❒	❒	❒
20) My child's evaluation report is written in terms and language I understand.	❒	❒	❒	❒
21) Teachers are available to communicate with me in a variety of ways (i.e. phone, email, notes, etc.).	❒	❒	❒	❒
22) The school shows sensitivity to the needs of my child and other students with disabilities and their families.	❒	❒	❒	❒
23) Written information I receive is understandable.	❒	❒	❒	❒
24) Teachers and administrators respect my cultural heritage.	❒	❒	❒	❒
25) I know who to contact if a special education issue arises.	❒	❒	❒	❒
26) Teachers are knowledgeable about my child's disability.	❒	❒	❒	❒
27) The principal supports appropriate special education services in the school.	❒	❒	❒	❒
28) General education and special education personnel work together to assure that my child's Individualized Education Program is being implemented.	❒	❒	❒	❒
29) The school encourages student involvement in Case Conference Committee meetings.	❒	❒	❒	❒
30) I am knowledgeable about federal and state laws that affect special education.	❒	❒	❒	❒
31) Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family understands how the special education system works.	❒	❒	❒	❒

Child's School:	**Check One:** Child's Primary Exceptionality/Disability: ❒ Autism Spectrum Disorder ❒ Blind or Low Vision ❒ Cognitive Disability ❒ Deaf or Hard of Hearing ❒ Deaf-Blind ❒ Developmental Delay ❒ Emotional Disability ❒ Language or Speech Impairment ❒ Multiple Disabilities ❒ Other Health Impairment ❒ Orthopedic Impairment ❒ Specific Learning Disability ❒ Traumatic Brain Injury	**Check One:** Child's Race / Ethnicity: ❒ White ❒ Black or African-American ❒ Hispanic or Latino ❒ Asian or Pacific Islander ❒ American Indian or Alaskan Native ❒ Multi-racial
Child's Age in Years:		
Child's Grade: Prekindergarten, Kindergarten, or 1 thru 12:		
Comments:		

Indicator 9 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See general Overview of the Annual Performance report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
In regards to Indicator 9, the student enrollment demographics and disability data is obtained from the State's September 2011 enrollment count and December 1, 2011 Child Count for the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) State Performance Plan (SPP)/APR submission. As required, the State utilized data collected on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA.

When reporting disproportionate representation in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR, Indiana utilizes two years of data, FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). As required Indiana reports race and ethnicity data using the seven racial and ethnic categories (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, and two or more races). This will be the first year that Indiana reports using these seven categories. Indiana has previously utilized five racial ethnic categories (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, not Hispanic, and White, not Hispanic), therefore the state will not be able to report FFY 2011 progress or slippage. Indiana looks forward to reporting progress or slippage utilizing the seven racial ethnic categories in the FFY 2012 APR due February 1, 2014.

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology:
As reported in the FFY 2010 APR, at the request of the Office of Special Education Programs of the US Department of Education, Indiana changed its definition of disproportionate representation *(or disproportionality)* to assure racial ethnic neutrality on January 13, 2012. Indiana defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 or a risk ratio less than 0.5[27] in special education and related services, for two consecutive years. Indiana established a minimum "n" size of 30 students in a given population. The minimum "n" size was established due to the instability of risk ratios in low "n" size situations as noted consistently (see e.g., Bollmer et al., 2007). The "n" size of 30 coincides with No Child Left Behind[28] which is utilized for similar purposes.

[27] The FFY 2011 Part B Indicator Measurement Table specifies that states are no longer required to report on under representation. http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/2013/index.html

[28] Since 2002, the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), has required public schools to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for both the overall student population and any demographic group within the school that includes 30 or more students (often called "subgroups"). These student subgroups include economic background, race/ethnicity, limited English proficiency and special education.

Indicator 9: Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY 2011 based on FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	Percent of districts that report disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 based on FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data:
When determining disproportionate representation, Indiana's definition requires an LEA to exceed the established 2.0 risk ratio for overrepresentation or 0.5 risk ratio for underrepresentation[29] thresholds for two consecutive years; therefore the State utilized the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data when reporting disproportionate representation in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR.

Step One: LEAs with Disproportionate Representation by Race or Ethnicity, in Special Education and Related Services:

Year	Total Number of LEAs[30]	Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation, by Race or Ethnicity, in Special Education and Related Services	Percent[31]
FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data)	**356**	**0**	**0%**

Based upon Indiana's definition of disproportionate representation as described above, the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data indicates 0% of the Indiana LEAs (0 out of 356) had disproportionate representation, by race or ethnicity, in special education and related services during the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) reporting period.

Twenty-five LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the required minimum "n" size of 30.

NUMBER OF LEAS WITH RACIAL/ETHNIC DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION IN SPEICIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES (OVER AND UNDER REPRESENTATION)							
	Hispanic/ Latino	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian**	**Black/ African American**	**Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**	**White**	**Two or More Races**
SPEICIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

[29] The FFY 2011 Part B Indicator Measurement Table specifies that states are no longer required to report on under representation. http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/2013/index.html
[30] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (356) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.
[31] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (356) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

Step Two: LEAs with Disproportionate Representation by Race or Ethnicity, in *Special Education and Related Services* that may be the Result of Inappropriate Identification:

Year	Total Number of Districts[32]*	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011 (2010-2011)	356	0	0	0%

If Indiana had reported LEAs with Disproportionate Representation they would have received a preliminary determination of FFY 2012 (SY 11-12) disproportionate representation on July 27, 2012. They would have been requested to complete the Indiana FFY 2011 (SY 10-11) Disproportionate Representation/ Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey by August 24, 2012.

The IDOE and its contracted agent would have reviewed and analyzed the surveys. Upon review the state would have determined:

1. The LEA to be in compliance based upon the review of the current FFY 2011 surveys and supporting documentation of appropriate policies, procedures and practices; or
2. A file review would need to be conducted if there was a lack of evidence in the self-assessment survey to determine the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices.

If a file review would have been determined necessary the state would have selected the files based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than 10) of case files of students representing the identified disproportionality. The specific purpose of the file review would to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a).

The two step process would determine the LEAs with disproportionate representation compliance status with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a).

Discussion of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:
Indiana is not able to report on FFY 2011 Progress or Slippage. When reporting disproportionate representation in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR, Indiana utilizes two years of data, FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) and FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). As required Indiana reports race and ethnicity data using the racial and ethnic categories (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, and two or more races). The FFY 2011 APR will be the first year that Indiana reports using these seven categories. Because Indiana has previously utilized five racial ethnic categories (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, not Hispanic, and White, not Hispanic) the state will not be able to report FFY 2011 progress or slippage. However, it should be noted that Indiana reported 100% compliance in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11), Indiana continues to report 100% compliance in FFY 2011 (SY11-12).

Indiana looks forward to reporting progress or slippage utilizing the seven racial ethnic categories in the FFY 2012 APR due February 1, 2014.

[32] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

Status: Indiana is reporting that it continues to meet the rigorous target of 0%.

FFY	Percent of districts that report disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	
	Actual	Rigorous Target
2006 (SY 06-07)	0.00% (0 out of 337)	0% (0 out of 337)
2007 (SY 07-08)	0.30% (1 out of 338)	0% (0 out of 338)
2008 (SY 08-09)	0.29% (1 out of 346)	0% (0 out of 346)
2009 (SY 09-10)	0.00% (0 out of 346)	0% (0 out of 346)
2010 (SY 10-11)	0.00% (0 out of 346)	0% (0 out of 346)
2011 (SY 11-12)	0.00% (0 out of 356)	0% (0 out of 356)

In FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) none of 356 LEAs were determined to meet Indiana's definition of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State did not report 0%):
Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this Indicator: **100%**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	**0**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**0**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**0**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):
Not Applicable. There were no FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
Not Applicable. There were no FFY 2010 findings of noncompliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
Develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive school-wide positive behavior support sites and increase educators' knowledge and understanding of how Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate and least restrictive environment placements	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive positive behavior supports. The project continues to work with emerging model sites to develop a state-of-the-art model of culturally responsive PBIS. The center collaborates closely with national leaders and a state advisory team to support a statewide PBIS network, including training and technical assistance. PBIS Indiana offered regional trainings throughout the state to scale up CR-PBIS across the state. This includes 25 schools working on Tier 1 supports and 26 schools working on Tier 2 supports. In addition, PBIS Indiana continues to work in the 4 assigned intensive districts providing technical assistance and support.
Continue to gather data on disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and disseminate to stakeholders through a variety of formats, including the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) website.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The State has continued to gather disproportionality data. The statewide data is available to anyone who visits the Equity Project website at: http://ceep.indiana.edu/equitydata. In addition, each LEA received their individual passwords on December 5, 2012 which gives them access to their LEA specific data. Information was disseminated on how to access and interpret the disproportionality data during the LEA Technical Assistance Forum on Disproportionality on September 4, 2012, the fall Indiana Council Of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) on September 28, 2012, DOE local/regional disproportionality trainings on July 23, 24 and 25, 2012 and Policy Briefs.
Provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the State to improve teaching and learning via the six Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers whose areas of focus are: • Autism; • Effective assessment and instruction; • Effective evaluations; • Effective and compliant IEPs; • Positive behavior supports; and, • Transition to adulthood. In additional statewide support DOE will be provide on:	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	Information regarding the IRN centers a can be found at: http://www.irn.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=Centers The following IRN centers are providing technical assistance related to disproportionality issues: PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center The Indiana University Equity Project at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) in collaboration with the Center for Education and Lifelong Learning at the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community (IIDC) is the IRN center whose focus is 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. The center is working on the following activities: • Development of an expanded RTI-based model of PBIS that addresses issues of culture and contributes to improved outcomes in achievement, graduation, and LRE; • Development of six model demonstration sites committed to the full implementation of the PBIS Indiana framework. This work includes culturally responsive training at Tier 1, 2, and 3; • Working with sites assigned by the IDOE to address identified insufficiencies through the implementation of the PBS Indiana framework; • Working with schools partially implementing PBIS, providing

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
• Parent training and information; • Assistive and accessible technologies; and, • Training for teachers of students who are deaf, blind or have low vision.		professional development and technical assistance as needed to move schools at any level of implementation to more complete implementation; • Conducting a survey statewide to assess the level of implementation in schools across the state; • Increasing capacity by building the knowledge base; and, • Development of a fully functioning and sustainable network of culturally responsive PBIS in Indiana. The center has developed an extensive list of tools that include web-based modules, publications and other resources on: • Culturally responsive practices; • Disproportionality; • Leadership teams; and, • PBIS frameworks. Effective Evaluation Resource Center (EERC) The EERC provides statewide professional development as well as targeted technical assistance to LEAs. The EERC focuses on increasing Indiana educators' skills and practices to ensure a) targeted and high quality interventions and strategies for struggling students and b) the use of appropriate special education evaluation procedures and eligibility guidelines for all students. The EERC provides assistance to LEAs in the correction of noncompliance and implementation of systemic changes to prevent future noncompliance. The EERC provided targeted technical assistance and statewide professional development related to appropriate identification practices and outcomes. This included: *g)* Coordination of the Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum, attended by leadership teams from 15 districts with findings for Indicator 4, 9, and/or 10. Resources and materials were developed to assist teams with root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan. EERC is providing ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data. *h)* Onsite technical assistance to LEA district leadership team including review and revision of procedures and practices, text-based discussions, and facilitation of leadership teams and disproportionality committees. *i)* Development of written and online resources for use by targeted LEAs and schools statewide. Resources focused on topics such as second language learners, assessment of English language learners, culturally responsive practices, and evidence-based behavior interventions. HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center The HANDS in Autism® Interdisciplinary Training & Resource Center provides unique learning opportunities designed to integrate and understand autism and related developmental disabilities through hands-on and coaching experiences. Training and/or consultation opportunities are offered throughout the State and are customized to

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
		meet the needs of a particular site determined based on a needs assessment of participants, schools, or the district, verbal feedback, historical review of trainings, and/or verbal discussion with stakeholders requesting such trainings and/or consultation. Such trainings are provided by a multidisciplinary HANDS training team who represent a combination of professionals from the fields of special education, general education, behavioral analysis, school psychology, public health, and clinical psychology. Such a broad range of experience allows us work with different populations and groups and is illustrative of the necessary collaboration involved with successful Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (CRSWPBS) and multidisciplinary teams. Trainings are based upon evidence-based practices in autism, as reported by the National Standards Project and National Autism Center, and in line with the proactive and positive behavioral plans promoted within CRSWPBS. These foundational components (i.e., proactive and positive behavioral plans) are a natural tie to the HANDS training curriculum and evidence based practices purported by the aforementioned report. Another hands-on training opportunity is offered through Summer Training, a week-long intensive training for school personnel that combines didactic training and hands-on experience in the HANDS classroom. In addition to hands-on training and consultations, HANDS in Autism® offers a growing depository of other learning opportunities: - Workshops for professionals and caregivers: a series of workshops based on the most popular topics that may include but not limited to creation of visuals supports for specific strategies, Q&A for parents, strategy training, etc. Offered live and online. - eLearning: self-paced interactive tutorials that range from general information about autism to the use of specific strategies. Upon successful completion of a tutorial and final quiz, participants will get a certificate of completion that could be used towards PGP. - Web-, podcasts, and videos: archived webinars on a range of topics. Certificate of completion is available for select options. Videos range from general information about autism to strategy video modeling. - Training Toolkits: resource toolkits that range from single strategy training to a setting-specific range of strategies training that could be used to train peers, parents, and colleagues. - Manuals: Large publications that offer helpful information and strategies for specific populations (e.g., caregivers of individuals with autism, etc). - Individual publications: handouts that range from general information about the disorders to specific strategy-based information, templates for academic and non-academic activities, functional skills training, etc. Materials in Spanish are also available.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
		- Collaboration with local professionals and families through the HANDS-initiated Local Community Cadres to meet needs of specific communities in training, material dissemination, and resource development. IN*SOURCE Parent Support Volunteers (PSV): IN*SOURCE continued to provide ongoing activities throughout the state to help support a network of one hundred and seventy (170) PSVs. IN*SOURCE has maintained this volunteer network for thirty-two (32) years. This program has successfully supported many thousands of parents of children with disabilities statewide, using a parent to parent service delivery mode. IN*SOURCE provided information and ongoing training and support to the PSVs via its statewide network of paid staff of Regional Program Specialist (RPS). Individual support to parent volunteers is available on an "as needed" basis and covers many different topics or issues including suspensions and expulsions of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP). During this seventeen month period, this parent volunteer statewide network provided training and assistance to nine hundred and fifty-six (956) families and other contacts statewide. This training and assistance included support to families concerning special education eligibility, eligibility categories and expulsion & suspension of students with IEPs. RPS: IN*SOURCE continued the maintenance of twenty-two (22) regional offices to insure an appropriate level of support for parents and educators in their communities. Statewide support to families and educators reflected in this activity are generally provided on an individual basis, and may include assistance provided by email, telephone or on a face to face basis. RPS in the regional offices assistance to families covered a range of topics concerning the education of students with disabilities. During this seventeen month period, IN*SOURCEs RPS provided assistance to sixteen thousand, three hundred and thirty-six (16,336) families and other contacts statewide. From this number of total contacts, three hundred and thirty-eight (338) contacts included information and support to families concerning suspension and expulsion. Statewide: IN*SOURCE staff also continued its support to parents of children with disabilities and educators statewide by providing both live and online training opportunities. These training programs cover a variety of topics including the special education processes, eligibility, IEPs, transition to adult life, and suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs. During this time period, IN*SOURCE staff conducted four hundred and ten (410) live trainings across the state, reaching seven thousand, five hundred and sixty-eight (7,568) participants. IN*SOURCE also reached three thousand and seventy-eight (3,078) participants through its online library of special education presentations. PATINS Project / ICAM The Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for all Students Project (PATINS Project) state-wide technical assistance

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
		network for the provision of assistive/accessible technology supports to assist Indiana's local educational agencies. As a sole source provider for the Indiana Department of Administration and the Indiana Department of Education, the PATINS Project works with local educational agencies to create, locate, and acquire flexible and accessible curricular materials and utilize technology tools that will support students with disabilities and reduce the existing barriers to learning in the classroom. By addressing learner barriers in the classroom through effective and accessible technologies, materials and instruction, the project provides resources (assistive technologies and training) to local educational agencies to develop compensatory strategies and access to tools to reduce the effects of student's disabilities and thereby allowing students to focus their ability on the specific demands of academic tasks and successfully demonstrate acceptable behaviours. The PATINS Project works with schools to reduce potential triggers of undesirable behaviour through the use of assistive technology and effective instruction by: • Utilizing specific assistive technology tools to monitor behaviour during assigned classroom tasks; • Utilizing strategies and assistive technology tools to self-regulate behaviour during academic task performance; • Accessing the curriculum in multiple, flexible and engaging ways • Maintaining a Refurbished Computer program, which supplies students with access who may not have computer access otherwise. • Maintaining and regularly updating an online set of video, text and audio resources available to LEA staff 24/7, • Maintaining a state-wide repository and delivery system of accessible instructional materials and, • Utilizing assistive technology to help students manage behaviours associated with social components of classroom activities.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) (if applicable):
There are no revisions to proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources for FFY 2011.

Additional Information Required by the FFY 2010 OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	No additional response required

Indicator 10 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See general Overview of the Annual Performance report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
In the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR , Indiana reported on Findings that were made March 30, 2012, during the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) reporting period based on the analysis of the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data review. For the purpose of reporting in the current FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR, Indiana is again reporting on Findings that were issued on March 30, 2012, as previously described, as well as the improvement activities completed in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Student enrollment demographics and disability data is obtained from the State's September 2011 enrollment count and December 1, 2011 Child Count for the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) SPP/APR submission. As required, the State utilized data collected on Table 1 (Child Count) of Information Collection 1820-0043 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. The State provides these data for Indicator 10 for children in the following six disability categories: cognitive disabilities, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism.

It is also important to note, as reported in the FFY 2010 APR, the Office of Special Education (OSEP) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC) began a review of Indiana's FFY 2009 Significant Discrepancy definition for Indicator 4B on July 19, 2011. Based upon this review, the State was required to change its Disproportionate Representation definition. On January 5, 2012, the State received written notice from OSEP indicting that OSEP had reviewed the State's submission and determined that the revisions proposed in the September 15 and October 3, 2011 emails resolved their concerns by providing a race-neutral methodology. On January 13, 2012, the Indiana Special Advisory Council (SAC) reviewed and provided input on Indiana's revised Indicators 9 and 10 disproportionate representation definitions. As directed by OSEP, the State changed its calculation methodology to assure compliance with 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22).

Beginning with the FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) APR, Indiana will report race and ethnicity data using the new seven, rather than the five, racial and ethnic categories (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, and two or more races).

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology:
As reported in the FFY 2010 APR, at OSEP's request Indiana changed its definition of disproportionate representation (or disproportionality) to assure racial/ethnic neutrality on January 13, 2012. Indiana defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories (American Indian

or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, not Hispanic, and White, not Hispanic) as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 or a risk ratio less than 0.5[33] in specific disability categories (Mental Disability, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Speech and Language Impairment, Other Health Impairment, and Autism) Please note, that effective with the FFY 2011 APR, the OSEP Part B measurement table no longer requires states to report on under-representation

Indiana established a minimum "n" size of 30 students in a given population. The minimum "n" size was established due to the instability of risk ratios in low "n" size situations as noted consistently (see e.g., Bollmer et al., 2007). The "n" size of 30 coincides with No Child Left Behind[34] which is utilized for similar purposes.

Indicator 10: Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY 2011 based on FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data analysis:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	Percent of districts that report disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) based on FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data analysis:
When determining disproportionate representation, Indiana's definition requires an LEA to exceed the established 2.0 risk ratio for overrepresentation threshold for two consecutive years. The State utilized the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) data when reporting disproportionate representation in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR.

Step One: LEAs with Disproportionate Representation by Race or Ethnicity, in Specific Disability Categories (Cognitive Disabilities, Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Disturbance, Speech or Language Impairments, Other Health Impairments, and Autism):

Year	Total Number of LEAs[35]	Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation, by Race or Ethnicity, in *Special Education and Related Services*	Percent[36]
FFY 2011 (using FFY 2010 and FFY 2009 data)	346	**56**	**16.18%**

Based upon Indiana's definition of disproportionate representation as described above, the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data indicates 16.19% of Indiana LEAs (56 out of 346) had disproportionate representation, by race or ethnicity, in specific disability categories during the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) reporting period.

Fifty-seven LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the required "n" size of 30.

[33] The FFY 2011 Part B Indicator Measurement Table specifies that states are no longer required to report on under representation. http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/bapr/2013/index.html
[34] Since 2002, the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), has required public schools to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for both the overall student population and any demographic group within the school that includes 30 or more students (often called "subgroups"). These student subgroups include economic background, race/ethnicity, limited English proficiency and special education.
[35] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.
[36] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

NUMBER OF LEAS WITH RACIAL/ETHNIC DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION BY SPEICIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILTY CATEGORY (OVER AND UNDER REPRESENTATION)						
	Black/ non Hispanic	**White/ non Hispanic**	**Hispanic**	**American Indian or Alaskan Native**	**Asian or Pacific Islander**	**Total Instances by Eligibility Category**
Cognitive Disability	13 over	3 over 6 under	-	-	-	22
Specific Learning Disability	-	2 over 2 under	2 under	-	-	6
Emotional Disability	5 over	7 over 3 under	-	-	-	15
Speech Language Impairment	3 under	6 over 2 under	-	-	-	11
Other Health Impairment	1 over	10 over 2 under	-	-	-	13
Autism	2 under	5 over	-	-	-	7
Total Instances by Race/Ethnicity	24	48	2	0	0	

(*Duplicative Count: 56 LEAs had a total of 74 instances of over or under disproportionate representation of racial ethnic groups in specific eligibility categories*)

Of the 56 LEAs with disproportionality, there were 44 LEAs with instances of over-representation of racial ethnic groups in specific eligibility categories and 17 LEAs with instances of under-representation of racial ethnic groups in specific eligibility categories. It is important to note that some LEAs had multiple instances of over and or under representation in multiple racial ethnic groups as well as in multiple disability categories.

Step Two: LEAs with Disproportionate Representation by Race or Ethnicity, in *Specific Disability Categories* that may be the Result of Inappropriate Identification:

Year	Total Number of Districts[37]	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation	Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in specific disability categories that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011	**346**	**56**	11	3.18%

The 56 LEAs were notified of the preliminary determination of disproportionate representation on December 11, 2011, and were requested to complete the Indiana FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self Assessment Survey by December 23, 2011. The IDOE and its contracted agent reviewed and analyzed the 56 surveys. Follow-up telephone interviews and email

[37] Indiana utilizes the total number of LEAs (346) in the State including those that do not meet the minimum "n" size in the denominator.

exchanges were conducted if needed with the LEAs regarding their survey, policies, procedures and practices. Based upon the review of the surveys and supporting documentation, it was determined that 43 of the 56 LEAs' disproportionate representation were not due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices. However, it was determined that an individual file review needed to be conducted on the remaining 13 LEAs with disproportionate representation. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students representing the identified disproportionality.

The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place for two of the 13 LEAs.

The Step Two analysis indicated that the disproportionate representation in 11 of the 56 LEAs was due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices. The 11 LEAs with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification were issued Indicator 10 Findings of non-compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a) on March 30, 2012. The notification informed the LEAs that they must immediately take action to correct the issue(s) of noncompliance. This may include changing policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance, as well as implementing the required steps to correct the identified noncompliance.

The 11 LEAs were also informed that, pursuant to 20 USC § 1416(a)(3), the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case longer than one-year from the date of the issuance of the notification.

Discussion of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011:
The State is not able to report on progress or slippage in the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) APR because the March 30, 2012 Findings the State reported on in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR were actually FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Findings. Indiana looks forward to reporting progress or slippage utilizing the seven racial ethnic categories in the FFY 2012 APR due February 1, 2014.

Status: Indiana is reporting that it failed to meet the rigorous target of 0%. In FFY 2011 (SY 11-10) 11 of 346 LEAs were determined to meet Indiana's definition of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in regards to Indicator 10. Review and analysis of 56 LEAs with disproportionate representation determined that 11 of the LEAs' disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices and that these 11 LEAs are noncompliant with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a).

NUMBER OF LEAS WITH FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) RACIAL/ETHNIC DISPROPORTIONATE OVER-REPRESENTATION DUE TO INAPPROPRIATE IDENTIFICATION BY SPEICIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILTY CATEGORY						
	Black/ non Hispanic	White/ non Hispanic	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Total Instances by Eligibility Category
Cognitive Disability	9					
Specific Learning Disability						
Emotional Disability	4	2				

Speech Language Impairment						
Other Health Impairment						
Autism						
Total Instances by Race/Ethnicity						

Duplicative Count: 11 LEAs had a total of 15 instances of disproportionate over representation due to inappropriate identification of racial/ethnic groups in specific eligibility categories.

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance (if State did not report 0%):
Level of noncompliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2011 for this Indicator: **3.18%**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2011 (the period from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012)	**11**
2. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**4**
3. Number of FFY 2011 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**7**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2011 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**7**
5. Number of FFY 2011 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2011 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**7**

FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

The state determined that four of the 11 LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012 had corrected their noncompliance within one year. (Note: When these Findings were issued, they were designated as FFY 2010 Findings; however, they should have been noted as FFY 2011 Findings). The state verified that the four LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2011 finding of Indicator 10 noncompliance and each of the four LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2011 Findings of noncompliance for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Systemic Noncompliance**:**

  The state verified systemic correction of the four LEAs FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting a file review. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students representing the identified disproportionality. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure

compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

- Verification of the Correction of FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Individual Cases of Noncompliance**:**

  The state verified that four LEAs had corrected each individual case connected with the FFY 2011 Finding of Indicator 10 noncompliance. The four LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

  It should also be noted that all seven of the LEA's that failed to correct their FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed each of the student's IEPs and other related documentation that had been determined to be noncompliant and assured each individual instance had been corrected for six of the seven LEAs.

  The seventh LEA failed to correct their FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, but submitted evidence in October 2012 and January 2013 that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. On January 25, 2013, the state completed its review of the students' current IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:

All seven of the LEAs that failed to correct the FFY 2011 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance were required to establish a leadership team and attend the September 4, 2012 Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum. Each of the LEA leadership teams were provided with resources and materials were assist teams with their root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan (CAP). Each of the seven LEAs were assigned to one of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers to provide them with ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: *(Note: As previously noted, the FFY 2010 APR indicated that the state had issued 7 FFY 2010 Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012. However these were actually FFY 2011 Findings of noncompliance.)*

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) using 2009-2010 data	**0**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**0**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**0**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):

None

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):
Not Applicable. There were no remaining FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance.

1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP's June 2010 FFY 2009 APR response table for this Indicator	**0**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has not verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings:
Not Applicable. There were no remaining FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
Not Applicable. There were no FFY 2009 findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable):
Not Applicable. There were no remaining FFY 2008 findings of noncompliance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
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	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	PBIS Indiana technical assistance center continues to develop and establish a statewide network of culturally responsive positive behavior supports. The project continues to work with emerging model sites to develop a state-of-the-art model of culturally responsive PBIS. The center collaborates closely with national leaders and a state advisory team to support a statewide PBIS network, including training and technical assistance. PBIS Indiana offered regional trainings throughout the state to scale up CR-PBIS across the state. This includes 25 schools working on Tier 1 supports and 26 schools working on Tier 2 supports. In addition, PBIS Indiana continues to work in the 4 assigned intensive districts providing technical assistance and support.
Continue to gather data on disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and disseminate to stakeholders through a variety of formats, including the IDOE website.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The State has continued to gather disproportionality data. The statewide data is available to anyone who visits the Equity Project website at: http://ceep.indiana.edu/equitydata. In addition, each LEA received their individual passwords on December 5, 2012 which gives them access to their LEA specific data. Information was disseminated on how to access and interpret the disproportionality data during the LEA Technical Assistance Forum on Disproportionality on September 4, 2012, the fall

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		Indiana Council Of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) on September 28, 2012, DOE local/regional disproportionality trainings on July 23, 24 and 25, 2012 and Policy Briefs.
Provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the State to improve teaching and learning via the six IRN centers whose areas of focus are: • Autism; • Effective assessment and instruction; • Effective evaluations; • Effective and compliant IEPs; • Positive behavior supports; and, • Transition to adulthood. In additional statewide support DOE will be provide on: • Parent training and information; • Assistive and accessible technologies; and, • Training for teachers of students who are deaf, blind or have low vision.	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	Information regarding the IRN centers a can be found at: http://www.irn.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=Centers The following IRN centers are providing technical assistance related to disproportionality issues: PBIS Indiana: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports Resource Center The Indiana University Equity Project at the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) in collaboration with the Center for Education and Lifelong Learning at the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community (IIDC) is the IRN center whose focus is 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. The center is working on the following activities: • Development of an expanded RTI-based model of PBIS that addresses issues of culture and contributes to improved outcomes in achievement, graduation, and LRE; • Development of six model demonstration sites committed to the full implementation of the PBIS Indiana framework. This work includes culturally responsive training at Tier 1, 2, and 3; • Working with sites assigned by the IDOE to address identified insufficiencies through the implementation of the PBS Indiana framework; • Working with schools partially implementing PBIS, providing professional development and technical assistance as needed to move schools at any level of implementation to more complete implementation; • Conducting a survey statewide to assess the level of implementation in schools across the state; • Increasing capacity by building the knowledge base; and, • Development of a fully functioning and sustainable network of culturally responsive PBIS in Indiana. The center has developed an extensive list of tools that include web-based modules, publications and other resources on: • Culturally responsive practices; • Disproportionality; • Leadership teams; and, • PBIS frameworks. Effective Evaluation Resource Center (EERC)

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		The EERC provides statewide professional development as well as targeted technical assistance to LEAs. The EERC focuses on increasing Indiana educators' skills and practices to ensure a) targeted and high quality interventions and strategies for struggling students and b) the use of appropriate special education evaluation procedures and eligibility guidelines for all students. The EERC provides assistance to LEAs in the correction of noncompliance and implementation of systemic changes to prevent future noncompliance. The EERC provided targeted technical assistance and statewide professional development related to appropriate identification practices and outcomes. This included: j) Coordination of the Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum, attended by leadership teams from 15 districts with findings for Indicator 4, 9, and/or 10. Resources and materials were developed to assist teams with root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan. EERC is providing ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data. k) Onsite technical assistance to LEA district leadership team including review and revision of procedures and practices, text-based discussions, and facilitation of leadership teams and disproportionality committees. l) Development of written and online resources for use by targeted LEAs and schools statewide. Resources focused on topics such as second language learners, assessment of English language learners, culturally responsive practices, and evidence-based behavior interventions. HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center The HANDS in Autism® Interdisciplinary Training & Resource Center provides unique learning opportunities designed to integrate and understand autism and related developmental disabilities through hands-on and coaching experiences. Training and/or consultation opportunities are offered throughout the State and are customized to meet the needs of a particular site determined based on a needs assessment of participants, schools, or the district, verbal feedback, historical review of trainings, and/or verbal discussion with stakeholders requesting such trainings and/or consultation. Such trainings are provided by a multidisciplinary HANDS training team who represent a combination of professionals from the fields of special education, general education, behavioral analysis, school psychology, public health, and clinical psychology. Such a broad range of experience allows us work with different populations and groups and is illustrative of the necessary collaboration involved with successful Culturally Responsive School Wide Positive Behavior Supports (CRSWPBS) and multidisciplinary teams. Trainings are based upon evidence-

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		based practices in autism, as reported by the National Standards Project and National Autism Center, and in line with the proactive and positive behavioral plans promoted within CRSWPBS. These foundational components (i.e., proactive and positive behavioral plans) are a natural tie to the HANDS training curriculum and evidence based practices purported by the aforementioned report. Another hands-on training opportunity is offered through Summer Training, a week-long intensive training for school personnel that combines didactic training and hands-on experience in the HANDS classroom. In addition to hands-on training and consultations, HANDS in Autism® offers a growing depository of other learning opportunities: - *Workshops for professionals and caregivers:* a series of workshops based on the most popular topics that may include but not limited to creation of visuals supports for specific strategies, Q&A for parents, strategy training, etc. Offered live and online. - *eLearning*: self-paced interactive tutorials that range from general information about autism to the use of specific strategies. Upon successful completion of a tutorial and final quiz, participants will get a certificate of completion that could be used towards PGP. - *Web-, podcasts, and videos:* archived webinars on a range of topics. Certificate of completion is available for select options. Videos range from general information about autism to strategy video modeling. - *Training Toolkits:* resource toolkits that range from single strategy training to a setting-specific range of strategies training that could be used to train peers, parents, and colleagues. - *Manuals*: Large publications that offer helpful information and strategies for specific populations (e.g., caregivers of individuals with autism, etc.). - *Individual publications:* handouts that range from general information about the disorders to specific strategy-based information, templates for academic and non-academic activities, functional skills training, etc. Materials in Spanish are also available. - *Collaboration with local professionals and families* through the HANDS-initiated Local Community Cadres to meet needs of specific communities in training, material dissemination, and resource development. IN*SOURCE Parent Support Volunteers (PSV): IN*SOURCE continued to provide ongoing activities throughout the state to help support a network of one hundred and seventy (170) PSVs. IN*SOURCE has maintained this volunteer network for thirty-two (32) years. This program has successfully supported many

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		thousands of parents of children with disabilities statewide, using a parent to parent service delivery mode. IN*SOURCE provided information and ongoing training and support to the PSVs via its statewide network of paid staff of Regional Program Specialist (RPS). Individual support to parent volunteers is available on an "as needed" basis and covers many different topics or issues including suspensions and expulsions of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP). During this seventeen month period, this parent volunteer statewide network provided training and assistance to nine hundred and fifty-six (956) families and other contacts statewide. This training and assistance included support to families concerning special education eligibility, eligibility categories and expulsion & suspension of students with IEPs. RPS: IN*SOURCE continued the maintenance of twenty-two (22) regional offices to insure an appropriate level of support for parents and educators in their communities. Statewide support to families and educators reflected in this activity are generally provided on an individual basis, and may include assistance provided by email, telephone or on a face to face basis. RPS in the regional offices assistance to families covered a range of topics concerning the education of students with disabilities. During this seventeen month period, IN*SOURCEs RPS provided assistance to sixteen thousand, three hundred and thirty-six (16,336) families and other contacts statewide. From this number of total contacts, three hundred and thirty-eight (338) contacts included information and support to families concerning suspension and expulsion. Statewide: IN*SOURCE staff also continued its support to parents of children with disabilities and educators statewide by providing both live and online training opportunities. These training programs cover a variety of topics including the special education processes, eligibility, IEPs, transition to adult life, and suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs. During this time period, IN*SOURCE staff conducted four hundred and ten (410) live trainings across the state, reaching seven thousand, five hundred and sixty-eight (7,568) participants. IN*SOURCE also reached three thousand and seventy-eight (3,078) participants through its online library of special education presentations. PATINS Project / ICAM The Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for all Students Project (PATINS Project) state-wide technical assistance network for the provision of assistive/accessible technology supports to assist Indiana's local educational agencies. As a sole source provider for the Indiana Department of Administration and the Indiana Department of Education, the PATINS Project works with local educational agencies to create, locate, and acquire flexible and accessible curricular materials and utilize technology tools that will support students with disabilities and reduce the existing

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
		barriers to learning in the classroom. By addressing learner barriers in the classroom through effective and accessible technologies, materials and instruction, the project provides resources (assistive technologies and training) to local educational agencies to develop compensatory strategies and access to tools to reduce the effects of student's disabilities and thereby allowing students to focus their ability on the specific demands of academic tasks and successfully demonstrate acceptable behaviours. The PATINS Project works with schools to reduce potential triggers of undesirable behaviour through the use of assistive technology and effective instruction by: • Utilizing specific assistive technology tools to monitor behaviour during assigned classroom tasks; • Utilizing strategies and assistive technology tools to self-regulate behaviour during academic task performance; • Accessing the curriculum in multiple, flexible and engaging ways • Maintaining a Refurbished Computer program, which supplies students with access who may not have computer access otherwise. • Maintaining and regularly updating an online set of video, text and audio resources available to LEA staff 24/7, • Maintaining a state-wide repository and delivery system of accessible instructional materials and, • Utilizing assistive technology to help students manage behaviours associated with social components of classroom activities.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) (if applicable):
There are no revisions to proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources for FFY 2011.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2011 with is proportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	See "FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)" section above.
If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	The state reviewed its improvement activities and determined that no changes needed to be made at this time.

Indicator 11 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60[38] 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))

Measurement:
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
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.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
In FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) 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 11 data was collected through the DOE-EV (Evaluation) report on July 1, 2012, and ranged from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 in order to encompass the entire reporting year. Students whose timelines are due to be completed after June 20, 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR reporting period were reported in this data collection. Through data verification and analysis, these students were identified and were excluded from the FFY 2011 measurement for Indicator 11. These students will subsequently be reported again in the data collection for the July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 reporting period and will be included in the FFY 2012 measurement for Indicator 11.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011	100% of all referrals are processed within the prescribed state timeline.

[38]IDEA states at 34 CFR § 300.301(c)(1) that initial evaluations "Must be conducted within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation; or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe." Indiana therefore rigorously requires that LEAs conduct initial evaluations within 50 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Children Evaluated Within 60 Days (or state-established timeline)	
a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	11,482
b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or state-established timeline)	11,239
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or state-established timeline) (Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	**97.9%**
The Number and Range of Days of Initial Evaluations Outside Required Timeline	
a. 1-5 Instructional Days	93
b. 6-10 Instructional Days	30
c. 11-15 Instructional Days	22
d. 16 + Instructional Days	38

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2011:

FFY	Target	Indicator 11 Actual Percentage
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	100%	97.9%
FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)	100%	98.5%
FFY 2009 (SY 09-10)	100%	98.0%
FFY 2008 (SY 08-09)	100%	92.3%
FFY 2007 (SY 07-08)	100%	87.7%

Indiana is reporting slippage of .6% for Indicator 11; however, Indiana remains above the 95% substantially compliant mark. Indiana attributes this slippage to a more thorough review of the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data. Additional guidance[39] was developed by the IDOE clarifying expectations for this indicator which lead to better data reporting and more accurate reflection of practice.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):
Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: **98.5%**

7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	**45**
8. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**41**
9. Number of FFY 2010 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**4**

[39] This memo is available at http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/initial-educational-evaluation-informaiton.pdf

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

10. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**4**
11. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
12. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**4**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings:
The 45 LEAs that were issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) 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 during the course of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from the 45 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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[40] was reviewed from the 45 LEAs issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). Compliance was measured in order to verify that corrective action plans and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The data was submitted by each LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. A total of 41 LEAs showed correction by submitting initial evaluation timeline data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2010 was Not Corrected:
For the 4 LEAs that failed to show correction of noncompliance during the evaluation period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012, the data was assessed and it was determined that the LEA failed to correctly implement the regulatory requirements of this Indicator.

Each LEA was required to complete a Root Cause Analysis as well as implement a Corrective Action Plan. Additionally, each LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 11 to track timelines throughout the school year. An IDOE compliance specialist will review the data monthly and communicate with the LEA regarding any deficiencies that are noted to ensure correction of inappropriate policies, practices and procedures. This intensive TA will continue throughout the end of the 2012-2013

[40] Indiana used the time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 APR response table for this Indicator	**0**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 findings:
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) has been corrected and verified as noted in the FFY 2010 APR.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2009 was Not Corrected:
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) has been corrected and verified as noted in the FFY 2010 APR.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance:

4. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings noted in OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator	**1**
5. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	**1**
6. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings:
During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), the state of Indiana followed procedures to verify that the one remaining LEA that received a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) corrected the finding of noncompliance. Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[41] was reviewed from the LEA. The data was submitted by the LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. It was verified that the LEA did not meet the requirement of completing all initial evaluations within the allotted timeframe with 100% accuracy.

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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

In FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the LEA was mandated to update policies, procedures and practices as well as create a CAP that included technical assistance from the Effective Evaluation Resource Center that is funded by the IDOE Office of Special Education. This CAP was supervised by an IDOE compliance monitor as well as the activities that were being conducted jointly between the LEA and the technical assistance provider, were evaluated to ensure that correction could occur. During FFY 2011, the SEA imposed additional sanctions including participation in technical assistance from the Effective Evaluation Resource Center and submission

[41] Indiana used the time period of April 1 to June 30 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.

of monthly status reports outlining the activities and outcomes of the work between the LEA and the Resource Center. Additionally, the LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 11 to track timelines throughout the school year.

This LEA reported 774 initial evaluations for FFY 2011 (SY11-12) and reported missing one evaluation during the review period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012. The IDOE subsequently reviewed monthly data submissions from June 2012 to November 2012. During this time period, the LEA completed all initial evaluations within the allotted timeframe with 100% accuracy, and it was thus determined that this LEA has corrected noncompliance relating to Indicator 11.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2008 was Not Corrected:
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) has been corrected and verified as noted in the information above.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2007:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings noted in OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 APR response table for this indicator	**1**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**1**

Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:
In April of 2009, Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from January 1, 2009 to March 31, 2009 was reviewed from each of the 295 LEAs issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2007 (SY 07-08). Compliance was measured in order to verify that CAPs and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The IDOE collected and verified the data using the State's data collection system. A total of 260 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window. The IDOE collected data from the remaining 35 LEAs that failed to correct FFY 2007(SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year during the course of FFY 2009 (SY 09-10). 11 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance during the second collection period.

In July of 2010, The IDOE collected data, utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining 24 LEAs that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. The time period of April 1, 2010 to June 30, 2010 was evaluated for each of the remaining LEAs that had failed to show correction of noncompliance. After the review of the data, a total of 23 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window, and one LEA remained as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007.

In July of 2011, the IDOE collected data, utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining LEA that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. The time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 was evaluated for the remaining 1 LEA that had failed to show correction of noncompliance. After the review of the data, the one LEA remained as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007(SY 07-08).

In July of 2012, the IDOE collected data utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining LEA that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. This LEA reported 168 initial evaluations for FFY 2011 (SY11-12) and reported missing seven evaluations during the review period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 due to inappropriate policies, procedures and practices. After the review of the data, this LEA remains as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007(SY 07-08). The table below represents the specific nature of the noncompliance for the one remaining LEA.

The Number and Range of Days of Initial Evaluations Outside Required Timeline	
1-5 Instructional Days	2
6-10 Instructional Days	1
11-15 Instructional Days	1
16 + Instructional Days	3

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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2007 was Not Corrected:
After analysis of the issues pertaining to why the noncompliance has remained it has been determined that the LEA has had a lack of appropriate policies and procedures as well as appropriately trained personnel to implement sufficient structures to ensure compliance with initial timely evaluations requirements. The LEA has taken action to correct the deficiencies as they have employed a new Superintendent as well as an Executive Director of Special Education. In order to ensure correction of this indicator, the IDOE has funded a full time compliance specialist in the LEA. This specialist is working with the LEA to correct inappropriate policies, procedures and practices and to oversee all initial evaluations completed to ensure they are done so in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

As outlined in the FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report, the State had taken multiple actions to ensure correction of this finding for the 1 remaining LEA. These actions have now included special conditions placed on the LEAs Federal Part B grant pursuant to34 CFR §80.12. The special conditions outlined that the LEA would be ineligible to submit for reimbursement for expenditures encumbered for expenses until two reports outlining their compliance with regulations had been submitted. The first report was due to the IDOE on December 1, 2012. The LEA failed to submit the report and thus have continued to be ineligible for reimbursement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
LEAs identified as not meeting the required timeline for completing educational assessments will be required to develop a corrective action plan for ensuring compliance.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Each LEA issued a finding for Indicator 11 developed a CAP in coordination with an education specialist at the IDOE that was monitored during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) or earlier, the previously developed CAP was evaluated for effectiveness and updated to reflect more comprehensive activities.

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
As part of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN), the Effective Evaluation Resource Center will assist LEAs and schools in reforming and improving their supports and services	FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	LEAs that have been issued findings for Indicator 11 accessed technical assistance through universal supports as well as targeted supports through the IRN. For those LEAs that were issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and showed egregious noncompliance, targeted technical assistance was assigned through the use of the Effective Evaluation Resource Center to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. The Effective Evaluation Resource Center provided an array of professional development and coaching opportunities, developed resources and materials, facilitated statewide and regional collaborative networks, and advanced the use of statewide technology during the evaluation process. Information pertaining to the Effective Evaluation Resource Center is located at the following url: http://www.indianaeerc.org
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.
Track monthly compliance for LEAs with uncorrected Findings **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	To ensure correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 or earlier, LEAs with outstanding Findings are required to submit monthly Indicator 11 data to the Office of Special Education to track timelines throughout the school year.
Distribute a Monitoring Workbook to LEAs found out of compliance containing an in-depth analysis of areas of noncompliance. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Each LEA found out of compliance for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) was issued a Monitoring Workbook containing details for each Indicator for which the LEA was found to be out of compliance. These Workbooks presented both a breakdown of data as well as a Root Cause Analysis. LEAs must complete the Root Cause Analysis, create a Corrective Action Plan, and, if applicable, correct any individual cases of noncompliance and return the completed Workbook to the IDOE Office of Special Education by a specified date. Upon receiving the completed Workbook, the IDOE is able to provide more targeted TA to ensure the noncompliance is corrected. An example of the Monitoring Workbook along with instructions is available at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring-guidance

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):
Indicator 11 data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) represents Indiana's third consecutive year scoring greater than the 95% substantially compliant mark. Although Indiana has seen gains in compliance under this indicator, improvement activities have been added to ensure the target of 100% compliance is obtained.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11)

Indicator Status	Indiana's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.	Please see the section above titled "Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2010 findings" as well as "Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2007 was Not Corrected".
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008, and the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007, were corrected. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has corrected the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2008 and the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.	Please see the section above titled "Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings" regarding the corrected remaining FFY 2008 finding. Please see the section above titled "Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2007 was Not Corrected" regarding the remaining FFY 2007 finding.
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	Please see the sections above titled "Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 findings," "Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings," and "Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2007 was Not Corrected".
If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	Indicator 11 data for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) represents the State's third year scoring greater than the 95% substantially compliant mark. Indiana has reviewed its improvement activities and made revisions to ensure compliance.

Indicator 12 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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.
Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d – e)] times 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
In FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the data for this indicator was submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to the state 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, 2012, and ranged from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 in order to encompass the entire reporting year. Students whose timelines are due to be completed after June 20, 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR reporting period were reported in this data collection. Through data verification and analysis, these students were identified and were excluded from the FFY 2011 measurement for Indicator 12. These students will subsequently be reported again in the data collection for the July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 reporting period and will be included in the FFY 2012 measurement for Indicator 12.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	100% 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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Measurement:	FFY 2011	FFY 2010	FFY 2009
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1240	3827	4403
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday	205	582	649
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	926	2752	3497
d. # 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.	94	174	160
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	5	142	34
# in a but not in b, c, d, or e.	10	177	97
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 Percent = [(c) / (a-b-d-e)] * 100	**98.93%**	**93.96%**	**97.80%**

The children included in (a) but not included in (b), (c), (d) or (e) represent those students whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays.

The data reflects that there were 10 eligible children who did not receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) by the age of three in Indiana. The data indicates that all 10 children did not receive a FAPE due to failure on the part of the LEA. Each LEA reporting noncompliance during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) was required to perform a root-cause analysis of noncompliance, complete all outstanding noncompliant timelines and update procedures and policies to enable compliance.

The range of days for the children who did not receive a FAPE ranged from one day to 133 days.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Indiana is reporting progress of 4.97% for Indicator 12. Indiana remains above the 95% substantially compliant mark. Indiana attributes this progress to a more thorough review of the FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data. Additional guidance[42] was developed by the IDOE clarifying expectations for this indicator which lead to better data reporting and more accurate reflection of practice.

[42] This memo is available at http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/initial-educational-evaluation-informaiton.pdf

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance in its FFY 2010 APR):
Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2010 for this indicator: 93.96%

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	**30**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**29**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**1**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**1**
5. Number of FFY 20010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected [(1) minus (0)]	**1**

Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):
The 30 LEAs that were issued Indicator 12 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) 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 during the course of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from the 45 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 timelines were completed, although late. The IDOE verified the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)

Indicator 12 data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[43] was reviewed from the 30 LEAs issued Indicator 12 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). Compliance was measured in order to verify that corrective action plans and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The data was submitted by each LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. A total of 29 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2010 was Not Corrected:
For the one LEA that failed to show correction of noncompliance during the evaluation period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012, the data was assessed and it was determined that the LEA failed to correctly implement the regulatory requirements of this Indicator.

[43] Indiana used the time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.

This LEA was required to complete a Root Cause Analysis as well as implement a Corrective Action Plan. Additionally, this LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 12 to track timelines throughout the school year. An IDOE compliance specialist will review the data monthly and communicate with the LEA regarding any deficiencies that are noted and ensure correction of inappropriate policies, practices and procedures.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Provide timely feedback on LEA submitted data through statistical reports and follow up to correct incomplete or inaccurate data.	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	As part of providing feedback and monitoring the accuracy of the data reported on the DOE-EV for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11), Indiana issued 16 Indicator 20 findings for LEAs who failed to report accurate data. All LEAs that were issued an Indicator 20 finding were required to complete a root cause analysis. This was facilitated through the use of the tool that was provided on the Right IDEA website (http://therightidea.tadnet.org/assets/398) and adapted to meet the needs for Indiana.
The Office of Special Education Early Childhood Coordinator will provide statewide updates on LEA progress in meeting requirements for Indicator 12 to early childhood administrators at their annual Spring conference. Early childhood administrators representing LEAs that achieve 100% compliance on implementing IEPs by third birthday will receive a certificate of recognition. A statewide data showing LEAs with LEAs that did not achieve compliance shall be distributed. Early childhood administrators shall discuss noncompliance and share strategies that work to correct noncompliance.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY12-13)	The Early Childhood Conference was cancelled for the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) time period. The conference has been scheduled for the FFY 2011 (SY11-12) reporting period and the IDOE will be completing activities regarding this indicator.
Utilize the evidence-based research and resources from the National Early Childhood Transition Center (NECTC) and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC).	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE continues to use evidence-based research and resources from the NECTC and the NCRRC to further contribute to accurate data reporting by the SEA and LEAs.
The IDOE and First Steps will share transition data from each system to inform, verify, and correct inconsistencies. The information will be utilized to reconcile differences and inform local agencies of discrepancies in order to improve communication and data accuracy.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE has collaborated with the providers from First Steps to begin assigning Student Test Numbers (STNs) to children who are receiving services from First Steps. This unilateral mechanism for tracking students will allow for a more seamless transition from Part C to Part B and will provide more comprehensive information for state agencies as well as LEAs.

As part of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN), the Effective Evaluation Resource Center will assist LEAs and schools in reforming and improving their supports and services	Through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	LEAs that have been issued findings for Indicator 11 accessed technical assistance through universal supports as well as targeted supports through the IRN. For those LEAs that were issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) and showed egregious noncompliance, targeted technical assistance was assigned through the use of the Effective Evaluation Resource Center to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. The Effective Evaluation Resource Center provided an array of professional development and coaching opportunities, developed resources and materials, facilitated statewide and regional collaborative networks, and advanced the use of statewide technology during the evaluation process. Information pertaining to the Effective Evaluation Resource Center is located at the following url: http://www.indianaeerc.org
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately.
Track monthly compliance for LEAs with uncorrected Findings **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	To ensure correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 or earlier, LEAs with outstanding Findings are required to submit monthly Indicator 11 data to the Office of Special Education to track timelines throughout the school year.
Distribute a Monitoring Workbook to LEAs found out of compliance containing an in-depth analysis of areas of noncompliance. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Each LEA found out of compliance for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) was issued a Monitoring Workbook containing details for each Indicator for which the LEA was found to be out of compliance. These Workbooks presented both a breakdown of data as well as a Root Cause Analysis. LEAs must complete the Root Cause Analysis, create a Corrective Action Plan, and, if applicable, correct any individual cases of noncompliance and return the completed Workbook to the IDOE Office of Special Education by a specified date. Upon receiving the completed Workbook, the IDOE is able to provide more targeted TA to ensure the noncompliance is corrected. An example of the Monitoring Workbook along with instructions is available at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring-guidance

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):
Indicator 12 data for FFY 2011 (SY 10-11) represents growth of 4.97% and shows that Indiana is above the 95% substantially compliant mark. Although Indiana has seen gains in compliance under this indicator, improvement activities have been added to ensure the target of 100% compliance is obtained.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.	Please see the section entitled "Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2010 was Not Corrected" above.
When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.	This is outlined in the "Actions Taken if Noncompliance from FFY 2010 was Not Corrected" section above.
If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	Indiana added three Improvement Activities which are described in the "Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)" section above.

Indicator 13 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged 16[44] 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))

Measurement:
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) ÷ the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] × 100.

Overview of the Indicator:
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. As a component of the Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS), the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Office of Special Education contracted with the Center on Community Living and Careers (CCLC) at Indiana University for FFY 2011 (SY11-12) to conduct a compliance review of a randomly selected sample of students' transitional IEPs. The review was conducted to ensure that IDOE could meet the reporting requirements and to inform ongoing assistance for school corporations with compliance rates less than 100%.

To determine and ensure compliance to Indicator 13, the IDOE has developed the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist[45] based on a data collection tool created by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center 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

[44] In Indiana, Indicator 13 is measured according to State statute. Article 7 of the Indiana State Board of Education Special Education Rules sates at 511 IAC 7-43-4(a) that a Transition IEP must be in effect when every student with a disability turns 14 years of age or enters grade 9, whichever occurs first.
[45] Indiana's Transition Requirement Checklist http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/transition-requirements-checklist-indicator-13.pdf or this can be found on the Indiana Department of Education website at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-13-secondary-transition-iep-goals

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%.

The IDOE provided CCLC with a population database of all students who were receiving special education services and met the Indiana transition plan age criteria for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The database included the Student Test Number (STN), which is the state of Indiana's student identification number, and the School Corporation Number. To generate the sample, CCLC used Microsoft Excel software to run a random sampling program. Following the IDOE sample-size parameters, the sample size for each corporation was 3 percent of the population. If the corporation had less than 100 students with disabilities three students were selected for the review. For corporations with more than 500 students ten students were selected. The final sample consisted of 476 students across 116 corporations.

For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) the methodology utilized to collect and analyze the data for this Indicator was modified. In all years previous LEAs were given an opportunity to correct any potential noncompliance prior to the issuance of Findings of Noncompliance. When analyzing the data from past years it was determined, with input from the State Advisory Council on Education of Students with Disabilities (SAC) and the Indiana Council for Administrators of Special Education (ICASE), that this practice was only correcting individual cases of noncompliance and that systemic cases of noncompliance still existed. Data analysis revealed that the same LEAs from year to year were correcting individual cases of noncompliance but were not addressing the systemic portions of their programs that were deficient. Due to this perpetual cycle of not ensuring regulations surrounding transitional IEPs were followed, it was determined that beginning in FFY 2011 this practice would cease.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011	100% of IEPs for students with disabilities **aged 14**[46] and above include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

Year	Total number of youth aged 14 and above with an IEP	Total number of youth aged 14 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements	Percent of youth aged 14 and above with an IEP that meets the requirements
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	476	349	**73.32%**

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
With input from Indiana's State Advisory Council on Education of Students with Disabilities (SAC) and the Indiana Council for Administrators of Special Education (ICASE), the methodology for the analysis of Indicator 13 data has been changed and thus Indiana cannot report of the progress or slippage from FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) to FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

[46] In Indiana, Indicator 13 is measured according to State statute. Article 7 of the Indiana State Board of Education Special Education Rules sates at 511 IAC 7-43-4(a) that a Transition IEP must be in effect when every student with a disability turns 14 years of age or enters grade 9, whichever occurs first.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance:

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)	**49**
2. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**49**
3. Number of FFY 2010 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**0**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**0**
6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of FFY 2010 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):
Indiana reported data in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR at 84.05% (2471/2940) of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above have an IEP that met the requirements for Indicator 13. The state of Indiana issued 49 Indicator 13 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) that were identified through an assessment by an external evaluator using the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist. All 49 LEAs demonstrated correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window. Each of the 49 LEAs were verified by the IDOE as having updated policies, procedures and practices and correcting each individual noncompliant transition IEP that had been identified from FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). 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 [47] to ensure that the systemic noncompliance had been resolved. The LEAs were required to demonstrate 100% compliance during the IDOE's verification of correction data collection window, pursuant to the two required "prongs" of correction from OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
No action was taken for uncorrected noncompliance as all LEAs demonstrated correction within one year.

[47] Indiana's Transition Requirement Checklist http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/transition-requirements-checklist-indicator-13.pdf or this can be found on the Indiana Department of Education website at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-13-secondary-transition-iep-goals

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2009 (the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)	**77**
8. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	**68**
9. Number of FFY 2009 findings not verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**9**

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of FFY 2009 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**9**
2. Number of FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**9**
3. Number of FFY 2009 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**0**

Verification of Correction of FFY 2009 noncompliance (either timely or subsequent):
During FFY 2010 (SY 10-11), the state of Indiana verified that 68 out of 77 LEAs (88.31%) that received a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) corrected the finding of noncompliance. Nine Indiana LEAs were unable to verify and demonstrate the correction of an Indicator 13 finding within one year of the date of the issuance of the finding. The 9 LEAs that were identified as having remaining noncompliance were mandated to update policies, procedures and practices as well as work with and IDOE compliance Specialist and the Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center to correct all deficiencies.

The IDOE compliance specialists have collected and verified new data by obtaining a randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using the Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklists to ensure that the individual cases as well as systemic noncompliance had been resolved. The LEAs were required to demonstrate 100% compliance during the IDOE's verification of correction data collection window, pursuant to the two required "prongs" of correction from OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In all 9 LEAs correction of noncompliance has been verified at a level of 100%.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) has been corrected and verified as noted in the information above.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed in FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
The transition school to work Interagency Coordinating Council, (known as the "290 Committee") address statewide issues as they relate to transition.	FFY 2006 (SY 06-07) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Statewide Transition Policy Work group met 4 times this past year to conduct a policy analysis between Article 7 and VRS Transition Policy. Once the analysis was completed, feedback and input was sought through all stakeholders (School personnel, VRS staff and family members) at the Statewide Transition Forum and the INAPSE Employment Conference from approximately 95 individuals. The purpose of the feedback was to gather data on what is actually occurring in practice and provide recommendations for changes in VRS Policy and Procedures. Currently, those recommendations are being reviewed by the Statewide Transition Policy Workgroup with an outcome a revised policy and/or procedures for school and VRS collaboration.
Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center grant: Continue to work with school based transition personnel and other stakeholders to refine guidelines for CCCs in the development of the transition components of the IEP.	FFY 2005 (SY 05-06) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center continues to work directly with LEAs that have been issued findings for Indicator 13. Those LEAs, in conjunction with resource center staff, create action plans that are submitted and monitored by the IDOE to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center also provides a weekly communication entitled "Tuesday's Tips" that provides technical assistance surrounding post-secondary transition.
Support best practice transition methods and services that increase secondary and postsecondary outcomes by sponsoring and supporting the Statewide Transition Forum Conference, hosted by the Indiana Resource Network's Secondary Transition Resource Center.	FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Statewide Transition Forum was held in August of 2011. Information pertaining to the Statewide Transition Forum Conference can be found at the following homepage: http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/?pageId=3416

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Indiana Resource Network (IRN)	Through 2012 (SY 12-13)	As part of the IRN, the Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center created and enhanced professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity to improve school and post-school outcomes. The center's work focused on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and family involvement. The 6 IRNs LEAs in reforming and improving their supports and services to students with disabilities. One of the IRNs is dedicated to secondary transition; however, many of the IRNs have expertise in this area and provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure compliance in this area. LEAs can access technical assistance through universal supports as well as targeted supports via the IRN. Information pertaining to the IRN can be located at http://irn.indiana.edu
National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Intensive Technical Assistance Plan **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011(SY 11-12) through FFY 2014 (SY 13-14)	The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) applied and was awarded the opportunity to be an intensive state to partnership with NSTTAC: The following will be addressed in this partnership: • Implement and scale up evidenced based practices to improve academic and functional achievement of students with disabilities • Implement policies, procedures, and practices to facilitate students with disabilities participating in programs to prepare student for college and career readiness • Achieve 100%compliance with the Annual Performance Report for Indicator B 13
Distribute a Monitoring Workbook to LEAs found out of compliance containing an in-depth analysis of areas of noncompliance. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Each LEA found out of compliance for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) was issued a Monitoring Workbook containing details for each Indicator for which the LEA was found to be out of compliance. These Workbooks presented both a breakdown of data as well as a Root Cause Analysis. LEAs must complete the Root Cause Analysis, create a Corrective Action Plan, and, if applicable, correct any individual cases of noncompliance and return the completed Workbook to the IDOE Office of Special Education by a specified date. Upon receiving the completed Workbook, the IDOE is able to provide more targeted TA to ensure the noncompliance is corrected. An example of the Monitoring Workbook along with instructions is available at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/monitoring-guidance

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) (if applicable):
Although Indiana has seen gains in compliance under this indicator, improvement activities have been added to ensure the target of 100% compliance is obtained.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table for this Indicator (if applicable):

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified FFY 2010 for this indicator.	Indiana reported 100% correction of FFY 2009 findings. This was achieved by dedicating resources and time to intensive technical assistance to ensure compliance for Indicator 13. Three IDOE specialists did mandatory phone conferences, webinars, onsite training sessions, and step-by-step IEP walkthroughs with all the LEAs found to be out of compliance in both FFY 2010 and FFY 2009. Verification was determined by pulling random samples of IEPs monthly to track progress and compliance.
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining nine uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.	Indiana reported 100% correction of FFY 2009 findings. Please see the sections above titled "Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (either timely or subsequent" and "Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2009."

Indicator 14 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: 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)(A))

Measurement:
A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)	The percentage of students enrolled in higher education and had an IEP in effect upon leaving school will be ≥ 35.3%.
	The percentage of students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school and had an IEP in effect upon leaving school will be ≥ 49.6%.
	The percentage of students enrolled in higher education, in some other postsecondary education or training program or competitively employed or in some other employment and had an IEP in effect upon leaving school with be ≥ 87.1%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

(A.) # of students enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	796	**33.9%**
(B.) # of students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	1,456	**62.1%**
(C.) # of students 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.	1,828	**77.9%**
a. # of students enrolled in higher education	796	
b. # of students in some other postsecondary education or training program	208	
c. # of students competitively employed	660	
d. # of students in some other employment	164	

Measurement A as described by 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) asks for the percentage of young adults enrolled in a 2- or 4-year college. A total of 870 respondents indicated they were enrolled in such a school, while 13 responses in the "other" category also indicated this type of enrollment, for a total of 883 or 37.6% of the 2,346 responses. Measurement A also specifies that students should be enrolled for at least one full term. Of the 883 responses, **796, or 33.9%, of all 2,346 respondents were enrolled for at least one full term.**

Measurement B of 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) asks for the number of youth enrolled in higher education (as described in Measurement A) or competitively employed. Competitive employment includes pay at or above the minimum wage for 20 hours a week or more for at least 90 days during the year since leaving high school. Military employment and other settings with others who are nondisabled are included. Family business, self-employment, and employment in jail or in a sheltered workshop are excluded.

A total of 1,139, or 48.6%, of all respondents indicated that they were employed at or above the minimum wage for 20 hours per week for at least 90 days in the previous year since leaving high school. Once students working in family business, self-employment, and employment while in jail or in a sheltered workshop are excluded, 985, or 42.0% of all respondents, are considered "competitively employed." Of these, 660 were not also enrolled in higher education as described by Measurement A. Adding these to Measure A, **1,456, or 62.1%, of all respondents were competitively employed or enrolled in higher education** (this number also includes those that were both competitively employed and enrolled in higher education).

Measurement C computes the percentage of young adults who were enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or held some other employment during the year after leaving high school. Any "yes" response to Question 3 was included as the type of education specified (as both definitions of enrollment in higher education and enrollment in some other form of post-secondary education or job training program was limited to those enrolled for at least one complete term) . Likewise, any "yes" response to Question 6 was considered as being competitively employed or holding employment of some form (as both definitions are limited to those employed for at least 90 days). To prevent double-counting respondents, any persons who responded "yes" to both questions were subtracted from the total employed (as they are already counted in the enrolled total). **Of the 2,346 total respondents, 1,828, or 77.9%, were enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training program or competitively employed or held some other employment during the year after leaving high school.**

Of the 2,346 respondents to the post-graduate survey, 711, or 30.3%, indicated that they were both enrolled in higher education or some other form of post-secondary education or job training *and* competitively employed or in some other form of employment.

An analysis of the results of the survey disaggregated by region suggests that there may be variations in the behavior of IEP students who have left school. These differences could be due to either demographic difference, such as income and race, substantial policy differences at the LEA level or differences in employment opportunities by region for the general population that also affect former IEP students. For example, the survey results show that respondents from the south were less likely to have pursued some form of post-secondary job training or education (55.4%) than respondents in the north or central regions (58.8% and 62.0%, respectively). Respondents from the southern region were also more likely to have been employed since leaving high school (71.8%) than respondents in the north or central regions (69.6% and 69.9%, respectively).

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target	Progress
% Enrolled in higher education	32.8	33.9	≥ 35.3%	1.1%
% Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	56.7	62.1	≥ 49.6%	5.4%
% Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	75.1	77.9	≥ 87.1%.	2.8%

Indiana met and exceeded its target for Indicator 14B with progress of 5.4% from FFY 2010. Though the targets were not met for 14A and 14C there was progress for both from FFY 2010. Progress of 1.1%% was achieved for Indicator 14A and of 2.8% for Indicator 14C. In FFY 2011 Indiana implemented new Improvement Activities to continue the progress towards meeting targets for 14A and 14C, and these Improvement Activities are described below.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
Work with Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE) to produce the college and postsecondary resource directory annually.	FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The directory was created and administered via the IDOE website at http://www2.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/colleges-and-post-secondary-services-persons-disabilities-indiana-2011-2012-edition.pdf.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
Indiana Resource Network (IRN)	Through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	As part of the IRN, the Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center created and enhanced professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity to improve school and post-school outcomes. The center's work focused on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and family involvement. The 6 IRNs will assist LEAs in reforming and improving their supports and services to students with disabilities. One of the IRNs is dedicated to secondary transition; however, many of the IRNs have expertise in this area and provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure compliance in this area. LEAs can access technical assistance through universal supports as well as targeted supports via the IRN. Information pertaining to the IRN can be located at http://irn.indiana.edu
National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Intensive Technical Assistance Plan	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) applied and was awarded the opportunity to be an intensive state to partnership with NSTTAC. The following will be addressed in this partnership: • Implement and scale up evidenced based practices to improve academic and functional achievement of students with disabilities • Implement policies, procedures, and practices to facilitate students with disabilities participating in programs to prepare student for college and career readiness • Achieve targets in the Annual Performance Report for Indicator B 14
National Post-Secondary Outcomes (NPSO) Intensive Technical Assistance Plan	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Indiana Department of Education applied and was awarded the opportunity to be an intensive state to partnership with NPSO. The following will be addressed in this partnership: • Improved rigor and practicality in the data collection and reporting process for Indicator 14 using the current data collection system. • Embed Indicator 14 data within the Statewide Longitudinal Data Collection System for programmatic improvement. • Develop continuous improvement systems to use Indicator 14 data for statewide and local programmatic improvement.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Status
Modify the Electronic IEP tool to include rule of completion requirements regarding Indicator 14 survey responses **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE has embedded a rule of completion into the IndianaIEP system that requires the LEA to update contact information at a student's final annual case conference. The LEA must update current contact information and acquire a secondary contact to improve the department's ability to contact students after they exit secondary education. The IDOE also created a letter that provides a detailed description of the importance of and process involved with the post-secondary survey that automatically prints for the LEA to give to the parent when a student's final annual case conference is completed.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
Though Indiana improved results for 14A and 14C, targets were not met for the second consecutive year. Improvement activities have been added to ensure continued progress toward meeting the targets for this Indicator.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from the FFY 2010 Response Table	Indiana's Response
OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.	Based on data analysis it was determined that the data is representative of the population. Please see the explanation in paragraph 6 under Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Indicator 15 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:
a. # of findings of noncompliance.
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Describe the process for selecting LEAs for Monitoring:
During FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) the state of Indiana made findings of noncompliance by utilizing the State's data reviews, onsite monitoring visits and desk-audits. The information and data input into the Indicator 15 worksheet below was collected, generated and tracked using the STN Application Center, in addition to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Due Process database, desk audits and the IDOE's Compliance Monitoring Database. Findings related to Dispute Resolution were made by each individual hearing or compliant investigator under the related requirements of the Indicator. All findings below were based upon timely and accurate data and include findings for both systemic and individual cases of noncompliance.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Actual Target
FFY 2011 SY (11-12)	100% Noncompliance corrected within one year	88.4

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. 2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. 14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training program, or both,	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
within one year of leaving high school.				
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments. 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. 4B. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**11**	**11**	**7**
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements. 6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**9**	**9**	**7**
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**11**	**11**	**4**
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
11. 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**45**	**45**	**41**
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**30**	**30**	**29**
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with 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 service needs.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	**49**	**49**	**49**
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			**155**	**137**
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			**(b) / (a) X 100 =**	**88.4%**

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2011:

FFY	Actual Target Data for Indicator 13
FFY 2011 SY (11-12)	88.4%
FFY 2010 SY (10-11)	89.5%
FFY 2009 SY (09-10)	97.9%

For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Indiana is reporting 88.4% of LEAs issued findings corrected those findings within one year of the issuance, representing slippage of 1.1%. Review of FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) data revealed that the majority of the uncorrected noncompliance stems from two data points that are collected as part of Indiana's compliance monitoring activities: Indicator 4B and Indicator 10. Eleven of the 18 instances of uncorrected noncompliance remained in these isolated categories, indicating overall Indiana's onsite monitoring component as well as general supervision system ensured timely correction.

As noted in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR, Indiana had to change its methodology for calculating Indicator 4B significant discrepancy of discipline and Indicator 10 disproportionate representation. Due to the mandated change in process Indiana was unable to complete the analysis within its usual timeframe and findings of noncompliance were issued six months later than normal. This affected the timeframe during which Indiana was able to provide necessary technical assistance for LEAs found to be out of compliance for these Indicators. This in turn limited the amount of time for LEAs to implement changes to the policies, procedures, and practices in order to have a systemic impact on identified noncompliance prior to the FFY 2011 review and analysis. While systemic noncompliance still remains for 4 LEAs for Indicator 4B and 7 LEAs for Indicator 10, Indiana has verified that all individual cases on noncompliance have been corrected. In the future, Indiana expects to return to the established timelines and issue all findings in November. Therefore, Indiana will be given a full year to provide technical assistance and support correction of noncompliance.

Two LEAs have subsequently corrected noncompliance for Indicator 5 beyond one year. Taking into consideration these additional corrected findings of noncompliance, Indiana's percentage for Indicator 15 would be 89.6%, showing progress of .1% from FFY 2010 (10-11).

Timely Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2010 (the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	**155**
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	**137**
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	**18**

FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2010 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	**18**
5. Number of FFY 2010 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	**2**

6. Number of FFY 2010 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	**16**

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (either timely or subsequent):

- ***Indicator 4A:***
  The state determined that all three LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Findings of noncompliance on January 31, 2012 had corrected their noncompliance within one year. The state verified that the three LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2010 finding of Indicator 4A noncompliance and each of the three LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2010 Findings for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Systemic Noncompliance:**
    The state verified systemic correction of the three LEAs FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4A Individual Cases of Noncompliance:**
    The state verified that the three LEAs had corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2010 Finding of Indicator 4A noncompliance. The three LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

- ***Indicator 4B:***
  The state determined that four of the seven LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012 had corrected their noncompliance within one year. The state verified that the four LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2010 finding of Indicator 4B noncompliance and that the four LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2010 Findings for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Systemic Noncompliance:**
    The state verified systemic correction of the four out of seven LEAs FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that four LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Individual Cases of Noncompliance:**
    The state verified that the four LEAs that had corrected their FFY 2010 Indicator 4B systemic noncompliance also corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2010 Finding of Indicator 10 noncompliance. The four LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

All three of the LEAs that failed to systemically correct their FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Finding did submit evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected for two of the three LEAs.

The one remaining LEA that failed to correct their FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, submitted evidence in October 2012 and January 2013 that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. On January 25, 2013 the state completed its review of the students current IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

- ***Indicator 5:***
  For FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indiana issued 9 findings under Indicator 5. Of the 9 findings that were issued, 7 were verified as having corrected the noncompliance within one year of the issuance of the finding. In order to verify correction, IEPs that were initially determined to be out of compliance for items relating to LRE were reviewed and each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected. In addition, the LEA's policies, procedures, practices as well as FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) child count data were reviewed to ensure that regulatory requirements were being met. To satisfy that the systemic correction of noncompliance had occurred, a random sample of the LEA's IEPs were harvested from the State's electronic IEP tool and evaluated for areas related to LRE. In 7 out of the 9 LEAs, this evaluation showed that each LEA was correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements at 100%.

  For the other 2 LEAs, the random sample of IEPs did not show 100% compliance, thus the findings remained past the one year of correction. For these LEAs IEPs that were determined to be out of compliance for items relating to LRE were reviewed and each individual case of noncompliance was verified as corrected. The SEA has since conducted follow up conferences and onsite verification visits for these LEAs and it was found that professional development activities as well as other procedural changes had been conducted but had not yet been fully implemented and therefore was not reflected within IEPs evaluated. When new samples of IEPs were evaluated and updated data was analyzed, it was determined that the 2 LEAs were implementing all regulatory requirements at 100% and were subsequently able to be released from the Indicator 5 finding.

- ***Indicator 10:***
  The state determined that four of the 11 LEAs that were issued FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Findings of noncompliance on March 30, 2012 had corrected their noncompliance within one year. The state verified that the four LEAs had systemically corrected the FFY 2010 finding of Indicator 10 noncompliance and each of the four LEAs had corrected each individual case of noncompliance discovered in connection with the FFY 2010 Findings of noncompliance for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Systemic Noncompliance:**
    The state verified systemic correction of the four LEAs FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance by reviewing each of the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting a file review. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students representing the identified disproportionality. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to

assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEAs had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

- **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Individual Cases of Noncompliance:** The state verified that four LEAs had corrected each individual case connected with the FFY 2010 Finding of Indicator 10 noncompliance. The four LEAs submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

  It should also be noted that all seven of the LEA's that failed to correct their FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed each the students IEPs and other related documentation that had been determined to be noncompliant and assured each individual instance had been corrected for two of the three.

  The seventh LEA that failed to correct their FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance issued on March 30, 2012, submitted evidence in October 2012 and January 2013 that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students that were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. On January 25, 2013 the state completed its review of the students current IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected

- ***Indicator 11:***
  The 45 LEAs that were issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) 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 during the course of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from the 45 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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)

  Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[48] was reviewed from the 45 LEAs issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). Compliance was measured in order to verify that corrective action plans and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The data was submitted by each LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. A total of 41 LEAs showed correction by submitting initial evaluation timeline data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window.

---

[48] *Indiana used the time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memo 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.*

- ***Indicator 12:***
  The 30 LEAs that were issued Indicator 12 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) 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 during the course of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12). The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from the 45 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 timelines were completed, although late. The IDOE verified the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)

  Indicator 12 data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[49] was reviewed from the 30 LEAs issued Indicator 12 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). Compliance was measured in order to verify that corrective action plans and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The data was submitted by each LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. A total of 29 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window.

- ***Indicator 13:***
  Indiana reported data in the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) APR at 84.05% (2471/2940) of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above have an IEP that met the requirements for Indicator 13. The state of Indiana issued 49 Indicator 13 findings in FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) that were identified through an assessment by an external evaluator using the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist. All 49 LEAs demonstrated correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window. Each of the 49 LEAs were verified by the IDOE as having updated policies, procedures and practices and correcting each individual noncompliant transition IEP that had been identified from FFY 2010 (SY 10-11). 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[50] to ensure that the systemic noncompliance had been resolved. The LEAs were required to demonstrate 100% compliance during the IDOE's verification of correction data collection window, pursuant to the two required "prongs" of correction from OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance not corrected for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010:

- ***Indicator 4A:***
  100% of the LEA's issued FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) Indicator 4A Findings of noncompliance, corrected the noncompliance within one year.

---

[49] *Indiana used the time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memo 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.*

[50] Indiana's Transition Requirement Checklist *http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/individualized-learning/transition-requirements-checklist-indicator-13.pdf or this can be found on the Indiana Department of Education website at http://www.doe.in.gov/achievement/individualized-learning/indicator-13-secondary-transition-iep-goals*

- ***Indicator 4B:***
  All three of the LEAs that failed to correct the FFY 2010 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance were required to establish a leadership team and attend the September 4, 2012 Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum. Each of the LEA leadership teams were provided with resources and materials were assist teams with their root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan (CAP). Each of the three LEAs were assigned to one of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers to provide them with ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data.

- ***Indicator 5:***
  All FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) findings issued for indicator 5 were verified as corrected.

- ***Indicator 10:***
  All seven of the LEAs that failed to correct the FFY 2010 Indicator 10 Finding of noncompliance were required to establish a leadership team and attend the September 4, 2012 Disproportionality LEA Technical Assistance Forum. Each of the LEA leadership teams were provided with resources and materials were assist teams with their root cause analysis and development of a corrective action plan (CAP). Each of the seven LEAs were assigned to one of the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) centers to provide them with ongoing support and facilitation to assist with CAP implementation and monitoring of practices and data.

- ***Indicator 11:***
  For the 4 LEAs that failed to show correction of noncompliance during the evaluation period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012, the data was assessed and it was determined that the LEA failed to correctly implement the regulatory requirements of this Indicator.

  Each LEA was required to complete a Root Cause Analysis as well as implement a Corrective Action Plan. Additionally, each LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 11 to track timelines throughout the school year. An IDOE compliance specialist will review the data monthly and communicate with the LEA regarding any deficiencies that are noted to ensure correction of inappropriate policies, practices and procedures. This intensive TA will continue throughout the end of the 2012-2013

- ***Indicator 12:***
  For the one LEAs that failed to show correction of noncompliance during the evaluation period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012, the data was assessed and it was determined that the LEA failed to correctly implement the regulatory requirements of this Indicator.

  This LEA was required to complete a Root Cause Analysis as well as implement a Corrective Action Plan. Additionally, this LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 12 to track timelines throughout the school year. An IDOE compliance specialist will review the data monthly and communicate with the LEA regarding any deficiencies that are noted and ensure correction of inappropriate policies, practices and procedures.

- ***Indicator 13:***
  All FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) findings issued for Indicator 13 were verified as corrected.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance:

7. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings noted in OSEP's FFY 2009 APR response table for this Indicator	**14**
8. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has verified as corrected	**14**
9. Number of remaining FFY 2009 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**0**

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (either timely or subsequent):

- ***Indicator 4B:***
  The state determined that the one remaining LEAs that was issued a FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance and failed to correct within one year has subsequently corrected the noncompliance.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Systemic Noncompliance:**
    The state verified systemic correction of the LEAs FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Finding of noncompliance by reviewing the LEAs FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Disproportionate Representation/ Significant Discrepancy Self-Assessment Survey and conducting file reviews. The files were selected based upon a 10% random sample (no less than five, no more than ten) of case files of students suspended or expelled for more than 10 cumulative days. The specific purpose of the file review was to determine if the appropriate policies, procedures and practices were in place to assure compliance with 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a). The file review provided evidence that the LEA had the appropriate policies, procedures and practices in place.

  - **Verification of the Correction of FFY 2009 Indicator 4B Individual Cases of Noncompliance:**
    The FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) Finding of noncompliance was based on identified systematic procedure and policy flaws that caused noncompliance in the LEA. Indiana's FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) significant discrepancy and monitoring process did not identify student specific cases of noncompliance, therefore there were no identified student specific cases to correct. However, as indicated above, the individual issues of noncompliance were specified in the FFY 2010 notification of continued non-compliance dated January 31, 2012.

    The state verified that the LEA had corrected each individual issue connected with the FFY 2010 notification of uncorrected Indicator 4B noncompliance. The LEA submitted evidence that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected for those students who were still within the LEAs jurisdiction. During the month of October 2012 the state reviewed the students IEPs and other related documentation and assured each individual instance had been corrected.

- ***Indicator 13:***
  During FFY 2010 (SY 10-11), the state of Indiana verified that 68 out of 77 LEAs (88.31%) that received a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) corrected the finding of noncompliance. Nine Indiana LEAs were unable to verify and demonstrate the correction of an Indicator 13 finding within one year of the date of the issuance of the finding. The 9 LEAs that were identified as having remaining noncompliance were mandated to update policies, procedures and practices as well as work with and IDOE compliance Specialist and the Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center to correct all deficiencies.

  The IDOE compliance specialists have collected and verified new data by obtaining a randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using the Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklists to ensure that the individual cases as well as systemic noncompliance had been resolved. The LEAs were required to demonstrate 100% compliance during the IDOE's verification of correction data

collection window, pursuant to the two required "prongs" of correction from OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In all 9 LEAs correction of noncompliance has been verified at a level of 100%.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2009:

- ***Indicator 4B:***
  All identified noncompliance for Indicator 4B from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) has been corrected and verified.

- ***Indicator 13:***
  All identified noncompliance for Indicator 13 from FFY 2009 (SY 09-10) has been corrected and verified.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings noted in OSEP's FFY 2009 APR response table for this Indicator	**2**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	**1**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**1**

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (either timely or subsequent):

- ***Indicator 4A:***
  The one remaining LEA that was issued a FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance has failed to correct. The FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Findings of noncompliance were based on identified systematic procedure and policy flaws that caused noncompliance in the LEA. Indiana's FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) significant discrepancy and monitoring process did not identify student specific cases of noncompliance, therefore there were no identified student specific cases to correct. However, as indicated above, the individual issues of noncompliance were specified in the FFY 2010 notification of continued non-compliance dated January 31, 2012.

  While the LEA failed to correct the FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) Indicator 4A Finding of noncompliance, the state did verify on January 25, 2013 that the LEA did correct each individual student specific issue of noncompliance associated with the FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) notification of continued non-compliance dated January 31, 2012.

- ***Indicator 11:***
  During FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), the state of Indiana followed procedures to verify that the one remaining LEA that received a finding of noncompliance for Indicator 11 in FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) corrected the finding of noncompliance. Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012[51] was reviewed from the LEA . The data was submitted by each LEA through an IDOE Data Collection and was extracted from the IDOE Data Warehouse for data verification. It was verified that the LEAs did not meet the requirement of completing all initial evaluations within the allotted timeframe with 100% accuracy.

[51] *Indiana used the time period of April 1 to June 30 as the period of verification that is required by OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and commonly known as "prong two" of verification of correction of noncompliance. Indiana chose the time period because statewide data indicates that approximately 1/3 of evaluations are completed during the reporting window. In order for an LEA to correct noncompliance, all timelines from April 1 to June 30 must be compliant.*

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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

In FFY 2010 the LEA was mandated to update policies, procedures and practices as well as create a CAP that included technical assistance from the Effective Evaluation Resource Center that is funded by the IDOE Office of Special Education. This CAP was supervised by an IDOE compliance monitor as well as the activities that were being conducted jointly between the LEA and the technical assistance provider, were evaluated to ensure that correction could occur. During FFY 2011, the SEA imposed additional sanctions including participation in technical assistance from the Effective Evaluation Resource Center and submission of monthly status reports outlining the activities and outcomes of the work between the LEA and the Resource Center. Additionally, the LEA was required to submit monthly data for Indicator 11 to track timelines throughout the school year.

This LEA reported 774 initial evaluations for FFY 2011 (SY11-12) and reported missing one evaluation during the review period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012. The IDOE subsequently reviewed monthly data submissions from June 2012 to November 2012. During this time period, the LEA completed all initial evaluations within the allotted timeframe with 100% accuracy, and it was thus determined that this LEA has corrected noncompliance relating to Indicator 11.

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2008

- ***Indicator 4A:***
  The analysis of the remaining LEA with the FFY 2008 (SY08-09) Indicator 4A noncompliance indicates the LEA has failed to subsequently correct. The analysis of the issues pertaining to why the noncompliance has remained indicates that the LEA has had a lack of appropriate policies and procedures as well as appropriately trained personnel to implement sufficient structures to ensure compliance. The LEA has taken action to correct the deficiencies as they have employed a new Superintendent as well as an Executive Director of Special Education. In order to ensure correction of this indicator, the IDOE has funded a full time compliance specialist in the LEA. This specialist is working with the LEA to correct inappropriate student discipline policies, procedures and practices regarding 34 CFR § 300.201 and 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22) as well as to oversee all initial evaluations completed to ensure they are done so in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

  As outlined in the FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report, the State had taken multiple actions to ensure correction of this finding for the 1 remaining LEA. In addition to the onsite DOE compliance specialist, special conditions were placed on the LEAs FY 2012 and FY 2013 Federal Part B grant pursuant to 34 CFR §80.12. The special conditions outlined that the LEA would be ineligible to submit for reimbursement for expenditures encumbered for expenses until two reports outlining their compliance with regulations had been submitted. The first report was due to the IDOE on December 1, 2012. The LEA failed to submit the report and thus have continued to be ineligible for reimbursement.

  Due to the extent of the ongoing issues, the LEA is required to continue to work with three of the IRN resource centers (Effective Evaluation, Effective and Compliant IEPs, and HANDS in Autism) during FFY 2012 (SY 12-13). These three centers, along with IDOE central office staff and the assigned on-site IDOE compliance specialist will work with the LEAs administrative team that includes representation from the Superintendent's office, general and special education administrators, building principals, district supervisors and consultants, federal programs, school nurses, social workers, IT staff, school psychologists, and an independent hearing officer. Information continues to be provided regarding LEA data related to suspensions and expulsions. The LEA administrative team as mandated developed a committee for special education compliance in order to review and monitor local practices and policies

related to suspension and expulsion. IRN center staff and the DOE assigned compliance specialist will guide, facilitate and monitor the direction of the LEA in these practices. In addition, the centers will coordinate school visitations and discussions with LEA staff and administration in efforts to address areas related to reducing behavior-related referrals and suspensions and expulsions such as data management, proactive strategy implementation, alternative skill development and general behavioral planning. The IRN centers provide guidance, support and monitoring for the LEA to develop and implement an extensive corrective action plan that the IDOE is closely monitoring.

- ***Indicator 11:***
  All identified noncompliance from FFY 2008 (SY 08-09) pertaining to Indicator 11 has been corrected and verified as noted in the information above.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 or Earlier:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2007 findings noted in OSEP's FFY 2009 APR response table for this Indicator	**1**
2. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected	**0**
3. Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	**1**

Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (either timely or subsequent):

- ***Indicator 11:***
  In April of 2009, Indicator 11 initial evaluation data from January 1, 2009 to March 31, 2009 was reviewed from each of the 295 LEAs issued Indicator 11 findings in FFY 2007 (SY 07-08). Compliance was measured in order to verify that CAPs and SEA consultation had corrected LEA noncompliance. This gave LEAs the opportunity to demonstrate correction by submitting current evaluation data more representative of revised evaluation processes. The IDOE collected and verified the data using the State's data collection system. A total of 260 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window. The IDOE collected data from the remaining 35 LEAs that failed to correct FFY 2007(SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year during the course of FFY 2009 (SY 09-10). 11 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance during the second collection period.

  In July of 2010, The IDOE collected data, utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining 24 LEAs that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. The time period of April 1, 2010 to June 30, 2010 was evaluated for each of the remaining LEAs that had failed to show correction of noncompliance. After the review of the data, a total of 23 LEAs showed correction by submitting data showing 100% compliance during the reporting window, and one LEA remained as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007.

  In July of 2011, the IDOE collected data, utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining LEA that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. The time period of April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 was evaluated for the remaining 1 LEA that had failed to show correction of noncompliance. After the review of the data, the one LEA remained as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007(SY 07-08).

  In July of 2012, the IDOE collected data utilizing the State's data collection system, from the remaining LEA that failed to correct FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) noncompliance within one year. This LEA reported 168 initial evaluations for FFY 2011 (SY11-12) and reported missing seven evaluations during the review period of April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 due to inappropriate policies, procedures and practices. After the

review of the data, this LEA remains as having failed to correct noncompliance from FFY 2007(SY 07-08). The table below represents the specific nature of the noncompliance for the one remaining LEA.

The Number and Range of Days of Initial Evaluations Outside Required Timeline	
1-5 Instructional Days	2
6-10 Instructional Days	1
11-15 Instructional Days	1
16 + Instructional Days	3

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 the completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system. The correction and subsequent verification of correction by the IDOE included each noncompliant timeline that occurred during FFY 2010 (SY 10-11).

Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2007

- ***Indicator 11:***
  After analysis of the issues pertaining to why the noncompliance has remained it has been determined that the LEA has had a lack of appropriate policies and procedures as well as appropriately trained personnel to implement sufficient structures to ensure compliance with initial timely evaluations requirements. The LEA has taken action to correct the deficiencies as they have employed a new Superintendent as well as an Executive Director of Special Education. In order to ensure correction of this indicator, the IDOE has funded a full time compliance specialist in the LEA. This specialist is working with the LEA to correct inappropriate policies, procedures and practices and to oversee all initial evaluations completed to ensure they are done so in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

  As outlined in the FFY 2010 Annual Performance Report, the State had taken multiple actions to ensure correction of this finding for the 1 remaining LEA. These actions have now included special conditions placed on the LEAs Federal Part B grant pursuant to34 CFR §80.12. The special conditions outlined that the LEA would be ineligible to submit for reimbursement for expenditures encumbered for expenses until two reports outlining their compliance with regulations had been submitted. The first report was due to the IDOE on December 1, 2012. The LEA failed to submit the report and thus have continued to be ineligible for reimbursement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Utilize available technical assistance from federally funded TA centers, including the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) and Data Accountability Center (DAC), by both attending TA coordinated conferences and by hosting TA center personnel for focused, one-on-one assistance. **Revised as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana continued through FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) to utilize the NCRRC for universal supports as well as one-on-one technical assistance.

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Coordinate and plan regular TA conference call with OSEP contacts and federally funded TA centers.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana continued through FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) to utilize its OSEP state contact and continues to schedule biweekly to monthly phone calls to ensure accuracy in information as well as transfer of knowledge from OSEP to the SEA.
Ensure quality LEA interventions and improvement in student outcomes by providing and supporting an external evaluator for the Indiana Resource Network efforts towards technical assistance, professional development and correction of noncompliance.	FFY 2010 (SY 10-11) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana has a current contract in place for an external evaluator who has designed an electronic system that will allow the IDOE to ensure that the interventions and technical assistance being provided by the IRN target correction of noncompliance within one year.
Define policies and procedures for data collection and reporting **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The Office of Special Education collaborated with the IDOE Office of Data and Accountability to define procedures for data collections and reporting pertaining to Special Education. These procedures established specific timelines for the process of data collection to both ensure all LEAs report their data in a timely manner and allow time for LEAs to seek any necessary clarification so that data is reported accurately and verification of correction of noncompliance can occur.
Track monthly compliance for LEAs with uncorrected Findings. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	To ensure correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 or earlier, LEAs with outstanding Findings for Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, and/or 12 are required to submit monthly Indicator data to the Office of Special Education to track compliance throughout the school year.
Distribute a Monitoring Workbook to LEAs found out of compliance containing an in-depth analysis of areas of noncompliance. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Each LEA found out of compliance for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) was issued a Monitoring Workbook containing details for each Indicator for which the LEA was found to be out of compliance. These Workbooks presented both a breakdown of data as well as a Root Cause Analysis. LEAs must complete the Root Cause Analysis, create a Corrective Action Plan, and, if applicable, correct any individual cases of noncompliance and return the completed Workbook to the IDOE Office of Special Education by a specified date. Upon receiving the completed Workbook, the IDOE is able to provide more targeted TA to ensure the noncompliance is corrected.

Improvement Activity	Timeline	Status
Gather data on disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and disseminate to stakeholders. **Added as of FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).**	FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE has gathered disproportionality data which is available to anyone who visits the Equity Project website at: http://ceep.indiana.edu/equitydata. In addition, each LEA received individual passwords on December 5, 2012 for access to their LEA specific data. Information was disseminated on how to access and interpret the disproportionality data during the LEA Technical Assistance Forum on Disproportionality on September 4, 2012, the fall Indiana Council Of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) on September 28, 2012, IDOE local/regional disproportionality trainings on July 23, 24 and 25, 2012 and Policy Briefs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (if applicable):
To address the slippage within this Indicator, Indiana has added multiple Improvement Activities relating to data collection and dissemination as well as LEA accountability. Indiana is hopeful these activities will ensure the state moves toward meeting the target of 100%.

Additional Information Required by the OSEP FFY 2010 APR Response Table for this Indicator:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR, were corrected. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR, that it has corrected the remaining three findings identified in FFY 2008 and the one remaining finding identified in FFY 2007. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State's explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of each finding of the remaining findings of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will take to ensure such correction.	Please see the sections above titled "Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (either timely or subsequent" and "Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2008" regarding the remaining FFY 2008 findings. Please see the sections above titled "Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (either timely or subsequent)" "Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2007" regarding the remaining FFY 2007 finding.

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.	Indiana has added four Improvement Activities to Indicator 15 which are described in the "Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12)" section above.
When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) are 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) have 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.	Indiana the listed elements of correcting noncompliance in the "Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (either timely or subsequent)" and "Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (either timely or subsequent)" sections above. Specific actions that were taken to verify the correction are described in the "Actions Taken if Noncompliance not corrected for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010" and "Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected of Remaining FFY 2009" sections above. The Indicator 15 worksheet is available in the section "Actual Target Data for FFY 2011."
Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.	Correction of noncompliance for to Indicators 4A, 4B, 10, 11, 12, and 13 is described in the "Verification of Correction…" and "Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected…" sections in each Indicator chapter of Indiana's FFY 2011 APR.

Indicator 18 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) ÷ 3.1) x 100

Measurable and Rigorous Target:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 11-12)	Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements will be 31.4%.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

3	Total Hearing Requests	67
3.1	Resolution Sessions	53
3.1 (a)	Settlement Agreements	44
3.2	Hearings Fully Adjudicated	2
Measurement = [(44 ÷ 53] x 100 =		**83.02%**

For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) sought to have 31.4% of resolution sessions conducted result in resolution session settlement agreements. The actual target data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) shows that 83.02% of resolution sessions conducted resulted in resolution session settlement agreements.

Explanation of Progress of Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
Indiana met and exceeded its target of 31.4% for Indicator 18 for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Refine and utilize the due process database to ensure that necessary elements are included in the system with respect to resolution sessions. For each due process request, the resolution process and the results of that process will be monitored.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana is currently in the process of writing an RFP to implement a new tracking system that will provide more comprehensive reporting capabilities.
Independent Hearting Officers (IHOs) will be trained and updated, at least annually, about resolution process and the procedures for monitoring the process.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	For FFY 2010 (SY10-11) the IDOE completed technical assistance and training for complaint investigators.
The OSE will work with parent organizations and LEAs to develop awareness of the option to resolve disputes through a resolution session.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	IDOE staff and members of the parent advocacy group, IN*SOURCE, work with parents to promote the use of mediation to resolve differences of opinion regarding the individual needs of students with disabilities. Information regarding the mediation process is located on the IDOE website at http://www.doe.in.gov/improvement/legal/special-education-mediation.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
For FFY 2011 (SY11-12) Indiana met its target for Indicator 18. Due to the fact that Indiana has met its targets for this Indicator, revisions to improvement activities for Indicator 18 will not be made at this time.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from the FFY 2010 Response Table	Indiana's Response
OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.	No action required.

Indicator 19 of the Part B State Annual Performance Report for FFY 2011

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:
See General Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement: Percent= [2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i) ÷ 2.1] x 100

Measurable and Rigorous Target:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (SY 11-12)	Percent of mediation requests that go to mediation will result in agreements 53.4% of the time.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

2.1(a)(i)	Mediations related to due process that resulted in complete agreement:	0
2.1 (b)(i)	Mediations not related to due process that resulted in complete agreement:	26
2.1	Total number of mediations held:	34
2.3	Mediations not held	8
Measurement = [(0 + 26) ÷ 34] x 100 =		**76.47%**

For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12), the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) sought to have 53.4% of mediations conducted result in agreements. The actual target data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) shows that 76.47% of mediations resulted in complete agreement, including 26 mediation agreements not related to due process.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):
The IDOE data for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) shows 76.47% of mediations conducted resulted in agreements. This shows progress of 17.09% from FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) data of 59.38%. Indiana met its target of 53.4% for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2011 (SY 11-12):

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Mediators will be surveyed for suggestions to improve process.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	The IDOE Office of Legal Affairs maintains communication with mediators to evaluate the mediation process.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Status
Conduct training sessions at least annually for mediators.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	For FFY 2011 (SY11-12) the IDOE completed technical assistance and training for mediators in the following areas: • Special education rules and regulations; • Mediation procedures and practices; • Mediation techniques; and • Areas of special interest and hot topics.
Develop a plan to increase public awareness to parents and LEAs to explain and encourage the use of mediation. In addition, design and complete a mediation document to disseminate to LEAs and parents regarding the availability of mediation services as well as other dispute resolution methods available in Indiana.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	IDOE staff and members of the parent advocacy group, IN*SOURCE, work with parents to promote the use of mediation to resolve differences of opinion regarding the individual needs of students with disabilities. Information regarding the mediation process is located on the IDOE website at http://www.doe.in.gov/improvement/legal/special-education-mediation.
Develop and utilize a database to track progress in mediations, including the mediation dates, results, withdrawals, and timelines.	FFY 2007 (SY 07-08) through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13)	Indiana is currently in the process of meeting with vendors to complete the writing of a Request for Proposal (RFP) to implement a new tracking system that will provide more comprehensive reporting capabilities as well as timeline management. This process has begun and will continue until a through investigation of the best system to be purchased can be completed. In addition to this work, a community was created for mediators on Indiana's online tool for teachers and the education community, Learning Connection, and it is required that mediators provide all mediation documents electronically through this site to improve timeliness.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2012 (SY 12-13):
For FFY 2011 (SY 11-12) Indiana met its target for Indicator 19. Due to the fact that Indiana has met the targets for Indicator 19, there will no revisions to the improvement activities for Indicator 19 at this time.

OSEP Response Table for FFY 2010 (SY 10-11):

Statement from the FFY 2010 Response Table	Indiana's Response
OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.	No action required.