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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

While the COVID-19 pandemic had some impact on indication data collection, the majority of indicators were not significantly affected for FFY 2019. Impact statements are included with each indicator. It is expected that the COVID-19 pandemic will have an impact on data collections during the 2020-21 school year and potentially beyond, which will affect SPP/APR reporting in future years.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

497

**General Supervision System**

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

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) administers a comprehensive system of general supervision that includes multiple components to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 and improve services and results for children and youth with disabilities. This system includes special education program and fiscal compliance monitoring, a comprehensive and effective dispute resolution system, and the provision of technical assistance and professional development to support stakeholders.  
  
The role of special education program monitoring is to provide general supervision and oversight of special education and early intervention programs using the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based compliance tool. MDE’s Division of Compliance and Assistance program monitoring unit uses MNCIMP as a tool to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for all children with disabilities, birth to age 21.  
  
Each special education administrative unit is monitored for compliance through MNCIMP which gathers data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. MDE moved from a five- to a six-year compliance monitoring cycle beginning in the 2015-16 school year in response to districts’ requests for a better opportunity to implement improvements and develop systemic changes. In year one of the cycle, LEAs conduct a self-review of student records including the most current Evaluation Report, Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation for compliance with legal standards. Records are selected using a computer-generated, stratified random sample representative of the most recent LEA enrollment data including race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability. Fidelity to the review process is ensured through a verification process of selected district reviews. In year two, LEAs must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02 and 34 C.F.R. Section 300.600(e).   
  
In year three, MDE conducts a more in-depth review of LEAs, including a review of student records following the same year one record selection process, on-site facility review, stakeholder interviews, and other documentation. Stakeholder input is gathered from special education teachers, administrators, related service providers, and paraprofessionals, as well as general education teachers and administrators. In year four, LEAs must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 and 34 C.F.R. Section 300.600(e). The fifth and sixth years of the cycle are used to verify results of any implemented corrective action plans (CAP) and improve district systems. In any given year, data is collected through the self-review of records for 20 percent of LEAs. Other aspects of program monitoring include review of complaint decisions to ensure noncompliance identified in a complaint is addressed systemically, and a review of LEAs’ Total Special Education System (TSES) plans. Districts’ TSES plans provide an organizational system referencing federal laws and regulations and state statutes and rules used to ensure special education services are provided to students with disabilities.  
  
MDE’s fiscal monitoring team works to ensure Part B funds are used to serve only eligible children and are administered under appropriate LEA internal controls. In FFY 2019 the fiscal monitoring team used a risk assessment to determine if an LEA is high, medium, or low risk. Based on risk level LEAs receive an on-site intensive review, targeted review, or no review but may access MDE resources, modeled after the federal monitoring process. It allows MDE to target higher risk categories and LEAs while providing more opportunity to work directly with LEAs on internal control system improvements. Once the LEAs are grouped into the on-site intensive review level, fiscal monitors use LEA provided data in the Special Education Data Reporting Application (SEDRA), the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS), and LEA general ledgers to pick samples related to time and effort, procurement, and transportation. Additionally, information is requested from the LEAs regarding inventory management, proportionate share and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). Online and on site staff reviews are also completed to corroborate processes and identify training needs. For those LEAs in the targeted level, the information requested is limited to the targeted topic for the year. The year following monitoring is used for corrective action by the LEAs based on the monitoring report. Corrective action may include improving documentation processes, changing documents to reflect appropriate data, or making corrections within SEDRA or MARSS so data entered is accurate. MDE retains the ability to reclaim funds used for ineligible purposes.  
  
The fiscal monitoring team also monitors funds used while a charter school is closing. This process is an abbreviated monitoring to ensure funds were used for eligible purposes while personnel are still available at the LEA. Fiscal monitoring also conducts investigations of fiscally-based complaints.  
  
MDE also administers a comprehensive dispute resolution system for the state. Parents and school staff can use mediation or facilitated team meetings to address issues of conflict. Parents and districts are entitled to an impartial due process hearing to resolve disputes over identification, evaluation, education placement, or provision of FAPE to an infant, toddler or student with a disability. Parents and districts are encouraged to use mediation, facilitated team meetings, conciliation, or some other mutually agreed upon alternative process before proceeding to a hearing. Information about the hearing system is available on MDE’s website including a hearing request form, information on free or low-cost legal resources, and Minnesota’s procedural safeguards notice. While the majority of due process hearing requests are settled or resolved without a hearing, if a hearing is requested, MDE forwards the request to the Office of Administrative Hearings, which conducts the hearings. MDE provides oversight of the due process hearing system and provides training to administrative law judges as well as to the Minnesota Special Education Mediation Service (MNSEMS) mediators and facilitators.   
  
The special education complaint system is designed to ensure that all children with disabilities are provided FAPE. A complaint can be filed about any entity that has allegedly violated a state or federal special education law or rule when providing publicly-funded intervention services directly to families and children with disabilities. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages parties to first contact the school district’s special education director for possible resolution and also suggests parties consider mediation. Sample complaint forms are available on the MDE website.  
  
When MDE receives a complaint, an investigator reviews the written complaint to determine the issues to be investigated. The complainant is contacted and the issues, claims and facts are discussed. MDE has 60 calendar days from the date the complaint is received to investigate and resolve the complaint. If the LEA is found to be in violation and a corrective action is deemed necessary, a CAP is developed. Through active follow-up, MDE ensures that CAPs are appropriately implemented and individual correction occurs within one year.

**Technical Assistance System**

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

Divisions across MDE provide leadership, technical assistance and oversight to LEAs that provide services to children and youth with disabilities. Below is an overview of the types of services and systems provided.  
  
Special Education  
  
This division works steadily toward our vision to give all children the necessary supports for healthy development and lifelong learning and mission to provide leadership that ensures a high quality education for Minnesota’s children and youth with disabilities. We model accountability by practicing values of respect, transparency, responsibility, and high standards, supporting whole-child thinking that tailors to a child’s unique needs. Strategic planning includes aligning division and agency priorities through focusing on areas that include most integrated setting, graduation and secondary transition, and equity to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The division strongly values partnerships with regional and district staff to improve outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities. This depends on a coordinated approach to implement school-wide prevention activities within multi-tiered systems of support, alignment and consistency of instruction and intervention to provide academic and behavioral supports, with additional supports to help facilitate consistency across staff, programs and funding streams. Staff across the division’s four units provide training, information and resources, policy development and technical assistance through a variety of projects and grants to help with local planning, service delivery, and program implementation, evaluation and problem solving, centered on positive outcomes for students.   
  
Over the past 12 years MDE has collaborated with the State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center in an effort to bridge the science-to-service gap and build the capacity of state education systems to implement and scale up effective education innovations statewide to ensure every student can benefit from the intended outcomes. MDE collaborates with the SISEP Center to apply and embed key components of implementation science to state educational initiatives, including Minnesota’s Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Division staff are significantly involved and provide leadership in this work.  
  
Compliance and Assistance  
  
This division has a prescribed protocol for managing the receipt and transfer of phone calls and emails requesting assistance with the provision of special education and related services. The protocol ensures that requestors are provided with timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support. The division website provides information on a range of special education topics and sample due process forms. MDE program compliance monitors are assigned to specific LEAs to provide consistent application of due process standards and an appropriate level of technical assistance. Through this process, monitors develop relationships with LEAs to obtain a broad understanding of their special education and early intervention programs and are better able to support LEAs in meeting legal requirements working to ensure students with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education.  
  
Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)  
  
MDE uses a variety of mechanisms to provide technical assistance (TA) to ECSE leaders and providers. The website is a source of information for families, administrators, and direct service providers. MDE hosts biannual forums to provide TA to local program leaders. Each fall, a three-day leadership conference is held in partnership with the Minnesota Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children. A one-day leadership forum is held each spring with an option to participate in the forum virtually. Members of the ECSE team hold monthly TA calls for program leaders and provide individualized TA requested by local programs. MDE has established a general ECSE email to allow local programs to receive timely, high quality answers to their technical questions from the most appropriate source.  
  
Equity and Opportunity  
  
This division is responsible for providing leadership, support, and programmatic accountability to school districts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as reauthorized under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). ESSA provides supplementary educational funds for disadvantaged learner programs, professional development of teachers and principals, and English language acquisition. The division’s work includes managing programs under McKinney-Vento, neglected and delinquent programs, foster care, migrant and English Learning education programs, rural education programs, family and community engagement, and federal accountability and data reporting. The division shares pertinent information and timelines with district designated contacts through an electronic newsletter, program listservs, meetings, conferences and trainings, live and recorded WebEx modules and MDE’s website. The division collaborates with other MDE divisions on topics and projects involving federal programs authorized under ESSA.  
  
School Finance  
  
This division provides resources to schools and districts to help improve or maintain financial health. Division work includes managing data collection and information on aid entitlements and levies related to general education, special education, and student accounting, as well as managing budget audits, facilities, transportation, payments, Uniform Financial Accounting and Report Standards (UFARS), and monitoring. The division implements state and federal education funding policies and provides assistance to districts and schools to understand and implement them at the local level. Division staff are responsible for the oversight of special education funding and provide financial management assistance and professional development opportunities throughout the year. They also regularly attend Special Education Directors’ Forums to provide updates, training, and technical assistance. Staff also work closely with the Governor and Legislature to promote enactment of sound PreK-12 education funding policies by providing policymakers relevant data and analysis.  
  
School Support  
  
This division works to build capacity and support leaders and teachers to improve student achievement in the areas of equity, school climate, continuous use of data, teacher collaboration to improve student learning, continuous improvement processes, leadership capacity, active implementation frameworks, professional development, fair and transparent evaluations, and stakeholder engagement. This support is provided through the Regional Centers of Excellence, School Climate Center, School Improvement Grants, and other professional development opportunities. The division also provides support for districts and schools in the areas of full-service community schools, English learner programs, family engagement, and interventions for students at risk of not graduating in four years.  
  
Statewide Testing  
  
This division is responsible for developing the Minnesota Assessment System administered to public students statewide to: 1) measure student achievement on the Minnesota Academic Standards and Minnesota standards for English language development; 2) meet district and school accountability requirements under ESEA as reauthorized under ESSA, and, 3) provide information for Minnesota graduates related to career and college readiness as required by Minnesota Statute §120B.30. In addition, the division provides resources, support, and training to school districts as they administer statewide assessments and report on results. Specific to the participation of students in special education, the Division collaborates with the Special Education Division in the development of assessments for students with disabilities and accommodation policy and procedures.

**Professional Development System**

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

Divisions within MDE responsible for the implementation of quality special education services provide a wide range of professional development opportunities and services statewide to address the needs of district and interagency staff, stakeholders, and families of students with disabilities. Activities include the following:   
  
Special Education  
  
Regional Low Incidence Projects (RLIP)  
RLIP staff assist school districts across the state to fulfill IDEA requirements in the areas of implementation, ensuring quality of service and the availability of high quality staff in the low incidence areas of special education. Training and technical assistance are provided through the coordination of MDE representatives, 11 low incidence projects, disability specialists and agencies serving students with disabilities and their families.  
  
School-Wide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (SW-PBIS)  
SW-PBIS provides an evidence-based framework for preventing problem behavior, providing instruction and support for positive and prosocial behaviors, and supporting social, emotional and behavioral needs for all students. Since initial implementation in 2005, training cohort numbers have steadily increased over the years representing an expanding number and diverse types of districts. In 2009 MDE moved to a regional training model to accommodate the growth of SW-PBIS implementation, dividing the state into three regions to coordinate training, coaching and evaluation of new schools. Presently, over 800 schools are implementing SW-PBIS across Minnesota.   
  
State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)  
In 2015 Minnesota was awarded a SPDG, and again in 2020. Both projects provide staffing, training and implementation support that aligns with our SSIP. MDE invests in building the capacity of LEAs through the use of implementation science and evidence-based practices that improve outcomes for students with disabilities. These grants support division goals to improve graduation rates for American Indian and Black students with disabilities through MDE-district partnerships. PACER, Minnesota’s designated Parent Training and Information Center, also supports partner districts to increase effective parent involvement to improve student outcomes. The 2015 grant also supported implementation of the Early Interaction Model and Autism Navigator to support early identification and increase capacity of early intervention providers to better serve infants and toddlers with ASD and their families.   
  
Other vehicles for professional development in the Special Education Division include:  
--Special Education Directors’ Forums held four times per year; since March 2020 Forums have been held monthly to provide information and support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic;  
--Support of and presentations at the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education conferences, Slice of Collaboration meetings, and New Leaders Training;  
--An Assistive Technology (AT) Teams Project that supports district team to learn and implement strategies to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities through the use of AT;   
--An Employment Community of Practice in collaboration with Minnesota’s Department of Employment and Economic Development and Department of Human Services to provide training and technical assistance to 53 LEAs; and  
--A variety of other cross-divisional trainings including webinars, workshops, brown-bags, and institutes that address a range of topics including transition, funding formula changes, Minnesota’s Olmstead Plan, and implementation science.  
  
Compliance and Assistance  
  
In FFY 2008, MDE initiated the requirement that all districts within the state participate in due process training as part of years’ one and three of the monitoring cycle. MDE requires these trainings twice within the six-year monitoring cycle and has added several additional optional trainings addressing various topics including correction of noncompliance, goals and objectives, transition, prior written notice, progress reporting, and district TSES requirements. MDE provides extensive training on the requirements of Part B compliance standards. The Division works with Early Childhood Special Education and Special Education to provide LEAs technical assistance and guidance on Part B IDEA requirements.   
The Division provides training on a variety of topics including restrictive procedures and positive behavior supports; student discipline compliance; prior written notice and progress reporting; eligibility guidelines for determining student participation in alternate assessments and how to document that determination in the IEP; special education for general education teachers and in nonpublic schools; and common misconceptions in special education. The Division’s website includes a variety of online trainings including IEP short- and long-term goals and objectives, progress reporting on IEP goals and objectives, secondary transition, positive intervention strategies, entering data in the MNCIMP self-review system, TSES plans, and uniform grant guidance.   
  
The Division’s fiscal monitoring team has initiated targeted training a year in advance of an LEA being monitored in order to allow the LEA to make corrections prior to MDE arrival. This team also provides multiple trainings a year available to all business managers and special education directors throughout the state, often traveling outstate to accommodate needs. Most recently, the fiscal team expanded training to include cross divisional topics with Special Education and School Finance. The trainings are provided at MDE-sponsored events and also at other professional organization-sponsored events.   
  
Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)  
  
The ECSE unit has participated in a variety of initiatives related to improving special education preschool services. Participation in federal grants and partnerships with national technical assistance centers have supported their ability to launch regionalized professional development focused on selected evidence-based practices; implement the Pyramid Model, an evidence-based practice for building social emotional competence; and to implement the Division for Early Childhood's revised recommended practices after receiving intensive technical assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center; enhance the collection and use of data at the state and local levels through participation in the ECTA/DaSy Child Outcomes Local Data Use Cohort; and receive support by the Early Childhood Personnel Center to enhance our Comprehensive System of Professional Development.   
  
Regional Centers of Excellence (RCE)  
  
The RCEs represent a collaborative effort between MDE and six regional service cooperatives to provide a statewide system of support consisting of intensive, onsite technical assistance to schools identified for support and improvement under ESSA. The RCEs were developed to provide a statewide infrastructure to support aligned and cohesive technical assistance that builds the capacity of schools and districts to utilize best practices in education. The support provided includes the application of the principles of effective practice and key components of implementation resulting in sustained and improved outcomes for all students. The RCEs are staffed by a director and content area specialists including math, reading, English language development, equity, special education, graduation, and implementation science. Representatives from a variety of divisions identify resources, develop and prepare materials, and provide technical assistance guidance resulting in research-based, coordinated support that can be contextualized by RCE staff to meet the specific needs of school leadership implementation teams. The Centers also have specialists who support districts and schools in the area of school climate, provide coaching to principals, and help with engaging schools’ and districts’ American Indian communities.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

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

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

MDE makes an annual determination on the performance of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) against specific criteria. MDE reviews all LEA performance against selected targets in the Annual Performance Report (APR) and determines whether each LEA met the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. MDE publicly reports special education data for each district in its Data Center website on the Data Reports and Analytics page under the Special Education District Profiles section.  
  
https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/Data.jsp  
  
A link to Minnesota’s current Part B Profile on the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP) SPP/APR public reporting website is located on MDE’s website under the Special Education section of the site:  
  
https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/sped/fed/  
  
When made available, the link to the FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be posted on the same website.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 61.18% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 58.43% | 61.14% | 60.76% | 61.18% | 62.30% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 10,609 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 63%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 10,609 | 62.30% | 90.00% | 63%2 | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

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

In Minnesota, graduation requirements are defined by Minnesota Statute §120B.024, and the definition of a diploma is provided by Minnesota Statute §125A.04. The graduation status of a student is decided at the local level in Minnesota; there is no state diploma and there are no alternatives to the regular diploma. A student who has received a GED is not included for these reporting purposes and, therefore, not counted when determining graduation rates. In order to graduate, students must be granted credits in the following areas: 4 credits in English language arts; 3 credits in mathematics; 3 credits in science; 3.5 credits in social studies; 1 credit in the arts; and a minimum of 7 elective credits. The specifics of how credits are granted are subject to local decision-making and control. In Minnesota there is only one diploma awarded to all students who successfully meet the requirements to graduate. Minnesota Statute §125A.04 states “Upon completion of secondary school or the equivalent, a pupil with a disability who satisfactorily attains the objectives in the pupil's Individualized Education Program must be granted a high school diploma that is identical to the diploma granted to a pupil without a disability.”

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.**

As stated above, the requirement that school districts grant a high school diploma to a student with a disability is codified in Minnesota law: “Upon completion of secondary school or the equivalent, a pupil with a disability who satisfactorily attains the objectives in the pupil's IEP must be granted a high school diploma that is identical to the diploma granted to a pupil without a disability.” Minn. Stat. §125A.04.   
  
For additional information the link below provides technical assistance documents on graduation for students with disabilities: https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/sped/caqa/grad/046628.  
  
In addition, the link below to Minn. Stat. §120B.02 describes educational expectations and graduation requirements for students in Minnesota: https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=120B.02.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Minnesota strives to ensure every student receives the support they need in order to obtain a high school diploma. While the primary goal is to reach graduation within four years, some students need additional time. In the process of developing Minnesota’s ESSA plan, stakeholders were particularly interested in incorporating a seven-year graduation rate into the accountability system to include students that are most likely to receive a regular high school diploma after four years, including students with disabilities, recently arrived English learners, and at-risk students. In addition to the state’s ESSA plan, internal and external stakeholders agreed that using an extended year graduation rate as our State Identified Measurable Result as part of our State Systemic Improvement Plan was a better measure for capturing the number of students who continue to progress and graduate past a typical grade 12 year. Prior to the development and approval of the state’s ESSA plan, Minnesota reported up to only a 6-year graduate rate; now 7-year graduation rates are reported for schools, districts and the state.  
  
Minnesota’s 2019 seven-year graduation rate for students in special education was 78.4%, which is .3% higher than the 2018 seven-year rate of 78.1%. The seven-year graduation rate has steadily increased for students with disabilities at an average of just over one percent (1%) per year over the past five years. It is important to note that the 2019 seven-year graduation rate is based on students in the class of 2016 (four-year cohort) who graduated in 2016, 2017, 2018, or 2019.  
  
Because this is lag year data, the data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 4.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.30% | 4.25% | 4.25% | 4.20% | 4.15% |
| Data | 4.16% | 4.34% | 4.60% | 4.80% | 4.82% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.15% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 7,003 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 51 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 813 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 21 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

The calculation of Minnesota’s dropout rate for students with IEPs is calculated by dividing the number of grades 9-12 dropouts within a given year by the October 1 grades 9-12 enrollments for that year. There is no requirement in ESEA for reporting overall or special education dropout rates under the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Since FFY 2005, Minnesota has used the above method for calculating dropouts. The data collection time period begins on October 1 and ends June 30 of that same school year. For the FFY 2019 APR, data collection began October 1, 2018 and ended in June 2019. This is the same calculation used for Minnesota’s FFY 2010 APR submitted on February 1, 2012. Minnesota has used this same calculation for dropouts for the FFY 2013-2019 SPP. Reported APR data lag one year per OSEP requirement.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1,788 | 40,440 | 4.82% | 4.15% | 4.42% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

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

Dropouts in Minnesota are defined as secondary students in any of grades 9 through 12 who:   
 --were enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and were not enrolled by October 1 of the following school year;   
 --were not enrolled on October 1, of the current school year although expected to be in membership, i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before;   
 --have not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program;  
 --do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:   
 \*Transfer to another public school district, private school, or state district approved education program.   
 \*Temporary absence due to suspension or school approved illness.   
 \*Death.   
  
“Status End” codes in parentheses (XX) identified as dropout codes include:  
(06) Student left school after reaching compulsory attendance age without written election (M.S. §120A.22 subd. 8 requires student and parent to meet with school staff prior to withdrawal).   
(07) Student left school after reaching compulsory attendance age with written election.   
(14) Student withdrawn after 15 consecutive days absence, students did not return.   
(15) Student left school because of marriage.   
(16) Student was expelled and did not return to school during the year.   
(17) Student left school due to pregnancy.   
(18) Student withdrew, no transcript requested, or student transferred to a non-approved nonpublic school.  
(31) Student left school for social reasons.   
(32) Student left school for financial reasons.   
(33) Student left school for family environment reasons.  
(34) For grades K-12 student left school for reasons unknown; for grade ED attempts to contact unsuccessful.   
(35) Student left school after age 21, did not graduate.   
(37) Student left school to attend a program to attend a GED program or withdrew after taking GED exam.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Because this is lag year data, the data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate 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.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 97.50% | Actual | 97.85% | 96.80% | 95.44% | 94.85% | 94.82% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 97.50% | Actual | 97.84% | 96.29% | 95.18% | 94.34% | 94.40% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 94.82% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 94.40% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Minnesota assessment data is available on the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) website under the Data Center tab. From the Data Center page users may select the Data Reports and Analytics link, then select ‘Assessment Files’ under the Accountability and Assessment section on that page. (MDE Website > Data Center > Data Reports and Analytics > Accountability and Assessment-Assessment Files). The direct link to the Assessment Files page is: https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/DataTopic.jsp?TOPICID=1  
  
The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) data are combined in one file, titled All Academic Accountability Tests under "Test Name" for assessments completed in 2019. Data files are also available separately by assessment. There is also a user guide available on this page which provides information on the previous and new file format and content, and about accessing the files. Please note that 2020 state assessment requirements were waived by the U.S. Department of Education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Questions about the files may be directed to mde.analytics@state.mn.us.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The 2020 state assessment requirements were waived by the U.S. Department of Education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2020 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2018, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f).  In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

MDE worked with Minnesota IT Services to update the Assessment Files spreadsheet on the MDE Data Center website (public reporting information is included above) to demonstrate that the state publicly reported on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as the state reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the 2019 Assessment Files spreadsheet now reports the number of children with disabilities who participated in regular assessments and were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district, and school levels. This updated information was provided to OSEP on December 1, 2020. It is MDE’s understanding that this remedy addresses the required action outlined in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

## 3B - OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2018, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The State provided the required information.  
  
The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** | HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2013 | Target >= | 34.00% | 35.00% | 36.00% | 37.00% | 38.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 34.12% | Actual | 34.75% | 33.56% | 32.92% | 31.30% | 32.05% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2013 | Target >= | 31.00% | 32.00% | 33.00% | 34.00% | 35.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 31.27% | Actual | 32.57% | 32.83% | 32.20% | 32.10% | 29.89% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2014 | Target >= | 36.00% | 37.00% | 38.00% | 39.00% | 40.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 36.69% | Actual | 36.69% | 36.84% | 36.74% | 36.24% | 35.71% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2014 | Target >= | 31.00% | 32.00% | 33.00% | 34.00% | 35.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 31.85% | Actual | 31.85% | 29.10% | 30.43% | 30.39% | 30.47% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2014 | Target >= | 24.00% | 25.00% | 26.00% | 27.00% | 28.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 24.02% | Actual | 24.02% | 25.50% | 24.71% | 25.80% | 25.54% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2014 | Target >= | 23.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% | 26.00% | 27.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 23.89% | Actual | 23.89% | 26.05% | 26.16% | 25.22% | 25.72% |
| **G** | HS | 2014 | Target >= | 23.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% | 26.00% | 27.00% |
| **G** | HS | 23.83% | Actual | 23.83% | 26.16% | 27.16% | 27.44% | 27.89% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 2013 | Target >= | 46.00% | 47.00% | 48.00% | 49.00% | 50.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 48.01% | Actual | 46.61% | 45.55% | 43.80% | 42.87% | 42.99% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 2013 | Target >= | 44.00% | 45.00% | 46.00% | 47.00% | 48.00% |
| **B** | Grade 4 | 44.22% | Actual | 44.30% | 42.81% | 41.88% | 39.92% | 40.47% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 2014 | Target >= | 31.00% | 32.00% | 33.00% | 34.00% | 35.00% |
| **C** | Grade 5 | 31.44% | Actual | 31.44% | 30.32% | 29.78% | 28.08% | 28.43% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 2014 | Target >= | 28.00% | 29.00% | 30.00% | 31.00% | 32.00% |
| **D** | Grade 6 | 28.66% | Actual | 28.66% | 25.95% | 26.59% | 24.99% | 25.22% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 2014 | Target >= | 21.00% | 22.00% | 23.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% |
| **E** | Grade 7 | 21.38% | Actual | 21.38% | 22.89% | 21.58% | 21.52% | 21.31% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 2014 | Target >= | 23.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% | 26.00% | 27.00% |
| **F** | Grade 8 | 23.20% | Actual | 23.20% | 23.66% | 24.09% | 22.56% | 23.36% |
| **G** | HS | 2014 | Target >= | 15.00% | 17.00% | 19.00% | 20.00% | 22.00% |
| **G** | HS | 15.59% | Actual | 15.59% | 15.80% | 15.46% | 15.98% | 14.35% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 38.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 4 | 35.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade 5 | 40.00% |
| Reading | D >= | Grade 6 | 35.00% |
| Reading | E >= | Grade 7 | 28.00% |
| Reading | F >= | Grade 8 | 27.00% |
| Reading | G >= | HS | 27.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 50.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 4 | 48.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade 5 | 35.00% |
| Math | D >= | Grade 6 | 32.00% |
| Math | E >= | Grade 7 | 25.00% |
| Math | F >= | Grade 8 | 27.00% |
| Math | G >= | HS | 22.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 32.05% | 38.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 29.89% | 35.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 35.71% | 40.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 30.47% | 35.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 25.54% | 28.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 25.72% | 27.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 27.89% | 27.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 |  |  | 42.99% | 50.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 4 |  |  | 40.47% | 48.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade 5 |  |  | 28.43% | 35.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **D** | Grade 6 |  |  | 25.22% | 32.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **E** | Grade 7 |  |  | 21.31% | 25.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **F** | Grade 8 |  |  | 23.36% | 27.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **G** | HS |  |  | 14.35% | 22.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Minnesota assessment data is available on the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) website under the Data Center tab. From the Data Center page users may select the Data Reports and Analytics link, then select ‘Assessment Files’ under the Accountability and Assessment section on that page. (MDE Website > Data Center > Data Reports and Analytics > Accountability and Assessment-Assessment Files). The direct link to the Assessment Files page is: https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/DataTopic.jsp?TOPICID=1  
  
The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) data are combined in one file, titled All Academic Accountability Tests under "Test Name" for assessments completed in 2019. Data files are also available separately by assessment. There is also a user guide available on this page which provides information on the previous and new file format and content and about accessing the files. Please note that 2020 state assessment requirements were waived by the U.S. Department of Education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Questions about the files may be directed to mde.analytics@state.mn.us.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The 2020 state assessment requirements were waived by the U.S. Department of Education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its 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 such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 4.43% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 1.40% | 1.35% | 4.43% | 4.20% | 4.00% |
| Data | 1.46% | 1.01% | 4.43% | 5.01% | 5.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

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

16

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 22 | 480 | 5.46% | 4.00% | 4.58% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Definition of Significant Discrepancy by Race or Ethnicity  
A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for children with IEPs compared to the state suspension and expulsion rate of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs among LEAs when the school district has a rate of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs that is 1.75 standard deviations at or above the state suspension and expulsion rate for children with IEPs.  
  
Methodology  
In FFY 2016, OSEP changed the requirements for calculating this indicator. The new language in the measurement table states that, “…if the State has established a minimum N-size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established N-size.” Upon review of Minnesota’s past calculation methodology, it was determined that the methodology needed to be adjusted to align with the new OSEP requirement. Therefore, the methodology reported in FFY 2016 for determining significant discrepancy was changed from years’ past. A new baseline and targets were set starting in FFY 2016.   
  
Starting in FFY 2016, Minnesota’s methodology requires a district to have a minimum N-size of 10 children with IEPs and at least one (1) child with an IEP suspended and/or expelled for more than 10 days during the school year to be included in the calculation. For FFY 2019, this means that 480 of the 496 districts in the state during the 2018-19 school year were included in the calculations and 31 districts were not included in the calculation because they either 1) did not have at least 10 children with IEPs and/or 2) did not have at least one child with an IEP suspended, and/or expelled for more than 10 days during the school year. Most districts in Minnesota do not have any children with IEPs who are suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days. Of the 480 districts included in the calculation, only 119 (25%) had any special education student suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days during the 2018-2019 school year. The calculations for the following essential data elements are as follows:  
  
State Suspension and Expulsion Rate for >10 days for Children with IEPs  
The total number of children in Minnesota with IEPs who were suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days was divided by the total number of children with IEPs. The result is the state suspension and expulsion rate of 0.505%. This is the rate against which district rates are compared.   
  
Number of children with IEPs suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in the state = 621  
Total number of children with IEPs ages 6-21 in 2018-19 = 123,101  
Statewide suspension and Expulsion Rate >10 days for children with IEPs = 621/123,101= 0.505%  
  
District Suspension and Expulsion Rate for >10 day for Children with IEPs  
Each district’s total number of children with IEPs who were suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days was divided by the total number of children with IEPs in the district. The result is the district suspension and expulsion rate that is compared to the state rate to determine significant discrepancy. All Minnesota school districts are included in the data analysis for Indicator 4A, including charter schools, provided the district enrolls at least 10 students with IEPs. Suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs are assigned to the students’ district of attendance.  
  
Cut point for Significant Discrepancy   
The standard deviation for the distribution of district rates of suspension and expulsion of more than ten days is .007625. A district is determined to be significantly discrepant if its rate of suspension and expulsion greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs was greater than 1.839%, (1.75 standard deviations from the statewide rate of 0.505%).  
  
The formula for Minnesota’s cut point follows:  
Cut Point = State Rate Suspension and Expulsion >10 + [(1.75) x (Standard Deviation)] = .00505+ [(1.75) x (.007625)] x 100 = 1.839%

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Because this is lag year data, the data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

The review of a district’s 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 compliance with the IDEA are included in MDE’s compliance monitoring process. Compliance monitoring of LEAs through administrative units occurs on a six-year monitoring cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA, including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented CAPs. The sixth year of the cycle provides an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.   
  
As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent LEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the LEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race or ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met. As part of the MDE review, staff interviews are completed to gain deeper understanding of the district’s policies, procedures, and practices.   
  
All monitoring data was reviewed for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2019, based on FFY 2018 discipline data, to identify any policies, procedures or practices that may 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 procedures. In FFY 2019, as a result of this review, no districts were found to have policies, procedures and 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 procedures.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 55 | 0 | 472 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Definition of Significant Discrepancy by Race or Ethnicity  
A district is considered to have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days for children with IEPs by race or ethnicity when, for the racial or ethnic category of consideration, the school district has a rate of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs that is determined to be at or above 1.75 standard deviations from the state suspension and expulsion rate for more than 10 days for children with disabilities from all racial or ethnic groups. Please note that the rates against which the comparisons are made are the same for all racial or ethnic groups.  
  
Methodology  
In FFY 2016, OSEP changed the requirements for calculating this indicator. The new language in the measurement table stated that, “…if the State has established a minimum N-size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established N-size.” Upon review of Minnesota’s past calculation methodology, it was determined that the methodology needed to be adjusted to align with the new OSEP requirement. Therefore, the methodology reported in FFY 2016 for determining significant discrepancy was changed from years’ past. This also required that a new baseline be set in FFY 2016.   
  
Starting in FFY 2016, Minnesota’s methodology requires a district to have a minimum N-size of 10 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest and at least one (1) child with an IEP in the race/ethnicity category of interest suspended and/or expelled for more than 10 days during the school year to be included in the calculation. For FFY 2019, this means 472 of the 496 districts in the state during the 2018-19 school year were included in at least one calculation for this indicator and 31 districts were not included in any of the calculations because they either 1) did not have at least 10 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest and/or 2) did not have at least one child with an IEP in the race/ethnicity category of interest suspended, and/or expelled for more than 10 days during the school year.   
  
Using this methodology, 55 districts (11.7%) met the data threshold for inclusion in the examination of data; 417 districts did not meet the data threshold. Staff from the Division of Compliance and Assistance reviewed information from the most recent six-year cycle of MDE reviews and district self-reviews of these 55 districts for the presence of policies, procedures, and 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.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Because this is lag year data, the data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

The review of a district’s 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 compliance with the IDEA are included in MDE’s compliance monitoring process. Compliance monitoring of LEAs through administrative units occurs on a six-year monitoring cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA, including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented CAPs. The sixth year of the cycle provides an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.   
  
As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent LEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the LEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race or ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met. As part of the MDE review, staff interviews are completed to gain deeper understanding of the district’s policies, procedures, and practices.  
  
All monitoring data was reviewed for the 55 districts that met the threshold for a significant discrepancy in FFY 2019, based on FFY 2018 discipline data, to identify any policies, procedures or practices that may 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 procedures. District special education and general education teaching staff were interviewed using an online survey platform regarding racially and culturally discriminatory practices and procedures, with a sampling confidence interval of 90%. Questions regarding discriminatory practices and procedures also are asked of general education leadership and directors of special education. As a result of this review, no districts were found to have policies, procedures and practices that contribute to a 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 procedures in FFY 2019. Therefore, no revisions of policies, procedures or practices were required at the SEA or LEA level.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2014 | Target >= | 60.52% | 61.00% | 61.50% | 62.00% | 62.50% |
| A | 60.52% | Data | 60.52% | 60.45% | 60.71% | 60.91% | 61.16% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% |
| B | 9.90% | Data | 10.09% | 10.08% | 10.07% | 10.04% | 9.98% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 4.00% | 4.00% | 4.00% | 4.00% | 4.00% |
| C | 4.70% | Data | 4.26% | 4.15% | 4.11% | 4.17% | 4.13% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 62.50% |
| Target B <= | 9.50% |
| Target C <= | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 126,692 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,639 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 12,569 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 4,960 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 84 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 285 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,639 | 126,692 | 61.16% | 62.50% | 61.28% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 12,569 | 126,692 | 9.98% | 9.50% | 9.92% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 5,329 | 126,692 | 4.13% | 4.00% | 4.21% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting occurred prior to March 2020; therefore, this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

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.

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.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 53.30% | 53.60% | 53.90% | 54.20% | 54.50% |
| A | 51.40% | Data | 55.17% | 56.66% | 58.20% | 59.32% | 58.28% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 18.40% | 18.30% | 18.20% | 18.10% | 18.00% |
| B | 19.90% | Data | 16.87% | 16.63% | 15.07% | 14.42% | 15.10% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 54.50% |
| Target B <= | 18.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

In addition to the stakeholder input described above, members of the Division of Early Learning Services obtained input on this target from a designated workgroup of the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) that included representatives of parents of young children with disabilities, a local program administrator and staff members from the Minnesota departments of Health, Human Services and Education. Proposed targets, identified by the workgroup, were shared with leaders of local early childhood special education programs for input prior to targets being formally adopted by the ICC at its January 2015 meeting. Performance and targets have been similarly reviewed by the ICC for each of the six subsequent APR submissions; most recently on January 12, 2021.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 19,196 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 11,343 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 2,680 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 63 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 11,343 | 19,196 | 58.28% | 54.50% | 59.09% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 2,743 | 19,196 | 15.10% | 18.00% | 14.29% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting occurred prior to March 2020; therefore, this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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); and

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.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2018 | Target >= | 71.40% | 71.50% | 71.60% | 71.80% | 72.00% |
| A1 | 65.93% | Data | 69.58% | 69.84% | 68.38% | 69.08% | 65.93% |
| A2 | 2018 | Target >= | 58.00% | 59.00% | 60.00% | 61.00% | 62.00% |
| A2 | 51.38% | Data | 55.32% | 55.46% | 54.17% | 53.19% | 51.38% |
| B1 | 2018 | Target >= | 71.80% | 71.90% | 72.00% | 72.20% | 72.40% |
| B1 | 67.84% | Data | 72.51% | 71.96% | 70.25% | 69.54% | 67.84% |
| B2 | 2018 | Target >= | 54.90% | 55.10% | 55.30% | 55.50% | 55.70% |
| B2 | 49.85% | Data | 55.04% | 54.70% | 52.80% | 51.94% | 49.85% |
| C1 | 2018 | Target >= | 72.60% | 72.70% | 72.80% | 73.00% | 73.20% |
| C1 | 67.64% | Data | 70.98% | 70.66% | 69.10% | 70.06% | 67.64% |
| C2 | 2018 | Target >= | 66.50% | 66.60% | 66.70% | 66.80% | 66.90% |
| C2 | 61.65% | Data | 64.34% | 64.89% | 63.45% | 62.78% | 61.65% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 66.03% |
| Target A2 >= | 51.48% |
| Target B1 >= | 67.94% |
| Target B2 >= | 49.95% |
| Target C1 >= | 67.74% |
| Target C2 >= | 61.75% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

In addition to the stakeholder input described above, members of the Division of Early Learning Services obtained input on this target from a designated workgroup of the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) that included representatives of parents of young children with disabilities, a local program administrator and staff members from the Minnesota departments of Health, Human Services and Education. Proposed targets, identified by the workgroup, were shared with leaders of local early childhood special education programs for input prior to targets being formally adopted by the ICC at its January 2015 meeting. Performance and targets have been similarly reviewed by the ICC for each of the six subsequent APR submissions; most recently on January 12, 2021. Specific to Indicator 7, MDE provided information for ICC members at the January 2021 meeting to review and consider regarding child performance and outcomes, trend data, and targets for each sub-indicator.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

6,717

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 10 | 0.15% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,845 | 27.47% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,611 | 23.98% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,554 | 23.14% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,697 | 25.26% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 3,165 | 5,020 | 65.93% | 66.03% | 63.05% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3,251 | 6,717 | 51.38% | 51.48% | 48.40% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 15 | 0.22% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,902 | 28.35% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,698 | 25.31% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,929 | 28.75% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,166 | 17.38% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 3,627 | 5,544 | 67.84% | 67.94% | 65.42% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3,095 | 6,710 | 49.85% | 49.95% | 46.13% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 12 | 0.18% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,542 | 22.96% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1,158 | 17.24% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,792 | 26.68% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,212 | 32.94% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2,950 | 4,504 | 67.64% | 67.74% | 65.50% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4,004 | 6,716 | 61.65% | 61.75% | 59.62% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A1** | During FFY 2018, Minnesota implemented a new process for districts to collect and report child outcome data. While maintaining the Child Outcome Summary (COS) option, districts could submit item-level assessment data from one of four approved tools. Just under ten percent of all children were included in this reporting option for FFY 2018; more districts were expected to report item-level data for FFY 2019. For FFY 2019 reporting period, we have a slight increase in item level data assessment being submitted and an increase of four percent (4%) over FFY 2018 that could be calculated into child outcome ratings. In analyzing the data for FFY 2019, the following observations should be noted:  --There is a significant discrepancy in outcome ratings that are calculated through the MDE data system based on the item level data submitted and the ratings that are completed and though completion of COS.   --The discrepancy is more prominent when either exit or entrance is calculated and the corresponding exit or entrance score was submitted by using the COS.   --Upon further analysis of the data, it was found that there may be an issue within the programming of our calculation function within the agencies data system. Currently, we are reviewing the correlating item level assessment components to the (d.) and (e.) ratings of student growth. It is hypothesized based on data that there is an expectation of performance outcomes that are more robust than we would expect for any student at the end of their preschool career.   Given the above data and concerns regarding the impact that standards previously set are having on item level data submission rating calculation, the MDE is going to fully review the data system, analyze components and correlating data benchmarking and calibration with all preschool programs before revising the timeline for the requirement of item level assessment data submission. It is the stance of the MDE that item level data submission remains the more objective and valid reporting practice and will resume this requirement once the system has been fully assessed and calibration has occurred.  While we expected that the transition to item level assessment data would lower our outcomes, which correlated with a reduction of targets, we did not foresee the concern regarding correlation of outcomes to measurements within our data calculation system that exceed expectations (early childhood indicators of progress age anchored standards) of exiting preschool age children. We are also cautious to place all reason for slippage on the data system alone and will continue to provide districts with professional development on high quality assessment practices (including timeliness, collaboration, and data collection practices), high quality instruction, and continue to emphasize the importance of high quality inclusion for children with individualized education plans. |
| **A2** | See reason for slippage under A1. |
| **B1** | See reason for slippage under A1. |
| **B2** | See reason for slippage under A1. |
| **C1** | See reason for slippage under A1. |
| **C2** | See reason for slippage under A1. |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

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

Minnesota's process allows local programs to use a variety of sources to inform the ratings on each Child Outcome Summary (COS) form. Teams may use information from norm-referenced tools administered as part of a child's initial evaluation. They may also use parent report and professional observation to complete an age anchored, criterion-referenced assessment tool. Minnesota's process requires careful use of the crosswalk documents developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. Minnesota requires ratings be made within a month of a child’s actual date of program entry or exit. For children exiting Part C and transitioning into early childhood special education services under Part B, the Part C exit rating becomes the Part B entrance rating. In the event that two different local teams serve the child under each part, the teams must reach consensus on an accurate Part C exit/Part B entrance rating.   
  
FFY 2018 was the first year that programs were provided an alternative to the COS form and process. Districts may now collect developmental data at a child’s entry or exit from Part B using one of four approved tools and submit that information to MDE using a specially formatted spreadsheet. MDE developed a system to transform the reported item-level data to calculate a COS 1-7 rating and aligns the data to the Minnesota Early Learning Standards, the early childhood indicators of progress. The approved tools include the COR Advantage, Desired Results Developmental Profile, Teaching Strategies Gold and the Work Sampling System (approved for use at exit only). While less than 10 percent of children had data reported using this methodology for FFY 2018, this increased to 13 percent for FFY 2019. MDE is currently analyzing systems, capacity, and logistics of this reporting system to ensure it is meeting the expectations initially set and calibrate as needed. Once this analysis is finalized, a new timeline will be determined as it relates to requiring districts to report item level assessment data. These same tools and process have been adopted for use across the state's school-based early learning programs and significant investment has been made in training, development, and infrastructure for ongoing collection and analysis of child outcomes across the state of Minnesota.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a good number of parents chose to withdraw their children from ECSE programs, requiring districts to complete exit rating data to ensure these students were included in COS outcome reporting. The MDE early childhood special education team worked closely with school districts to verify student enrollment and withdrawal data to ensure accurate COS reporting records were made. In addition, there were students with incomplete data due to their limited program engagement in the months of March through June 2020 which also likely had an impact on entrance and exiting reporting for the 2019-20 school year.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2007 | 71.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 71.00% | 71.00% | 71.50% | 72.00% | 72.00% |
| Data | 69.31% | 64.54% | 71.89% | 70.19% | 70.38% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 72.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 285 | | 405 | 70.38% | 72.00% | 70.37% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

1,571

**Percentage of respondent parents**

25.78%

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

Minnesota collects data for only one parent engagement survey; preschool children are included in the sampling procedure. See sampling methodology for more information.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

In 2005, all of Minnesota’s then existing charter and school districts were assigned to one of five groups to participate in the Statewide Parent Involvement Survey on a five-year cycle. Districts were divided so that each of the five groups represented the state at large, a sampling frame approved by OSEP. Since the first year of data collection in the 2006-07 school year, MDE has continued to survey parents in a representative sample of districts. Because of fluctuations in the population of operational charter districts, adjustments are made to the sample when charter schools either open or close. Because charter districts enroll a relatively small proportion of Minnesota students, the fluctuation in charter enrollment has little to no impact on the representativeness of each year’s sampled students.   
  
Prior to 2012 districts were asked to collect survey data from parents and forward responses to MDE. Beginning in 2012 districts provided family contact information (mailing and email addresses) to MDE and MDE took over sending out and receiving surveys. From 2012-2014 survey responses were collected over the course of a three-stage process. In 2015 a fourth stage was added to increase the response rate of targeted, underrepresented groups.   
  
In Stage 1 staff from MDE mail a paper copy of the survey to parents who were identified in the stratified random sample. The survey packet includes information on the purpose and importance of the survey, instructions to complete the survey, and directions for returning the paper survey to MDE. When the primary home language of students was identified as Hmong, Somali, or Spanish, parents receive two copies of the survey packet: one in English and one in their home language. In 2020, 160 non-English surveys were mailed, 33 to Hmong-speaking, 21 to Somali-speaking, and 106 to Spanish-speaking homes: Hmong, Somali, and Spanish are the most commonly spoken languages among non-English student homes in Minnesota. Parents may complete the paper copy of the survey in the language of their choice and return it in a postage-paid envelope or complete the survey online, which is available only in English.   
  
In Stage 2, approximately two weeks after the initial survey is mailed, all sampled parents are mailed a postcard in English, Hmong, Somali, and Spanish reminding them to complete the survey. In Stage 3 parents who have a valid email address and have yet to complete the survey are contacted via email in English to remind them to complete the survey. The email reminder is sent approximately two weeks after the postcard is mailed (four weeks after the survey was mailed).   
  
Stage 4 was introduced in 2015 reaching out to families who have not yet completed the survey by phone inviting them to do so; this practice was implemented especially to improve response rates among families of color and non-English speaking families. Typical outreach procedures including bringing Hmong, Somali, and Spanish interpreters to MDE to call families in the evenings when they are more likely to be home. Assigned MDE Division of Special Education staff would also complete phone calls during the work day or evenings from the office. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on office protocols and safety, Minnesota suspended this outreach for the FFY 2019 survey. It is expected that these or similar outreach procedures will be included in next year’s survey  
  
The FFY 2019 population of children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21 in Minnesota was 145,884; therefore, the receipt of completed surveys from parents of 405 of the children provides for a 95.5% confidence interval and a 4.86% margin of error. The Raosoft sample size calculator was used to estimate the confidence interval and margin of error (http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html).  
  
In FFY 2019 86 LEAs were included in the statewide parent survey. MDE utilized the 25-item National Center on Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) Part B Parent Survey, with three additional survey items on perceptions of transition planning, interagency coordination, and access to mental health services. Parents responded to the 28 survey items using a six-point Likert-type scale with the following response options: very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and very strongly agree. Each response option was assigned a numeric value ranging from 1 to 6:   
  
Very Strongly Disagree = 1  
Strongly Disagree = 2  
Disagree = 3  
Agree = 4  
Strongly Agree = 5  
Very Strongly Agree = 6  
  
In addition, parents were instructed to skip items that did not apply to them or their child with a disability.   
  
Potential parent respondents were randomly selected using a demographically stratified random sampling frame to produce representative samples. Out of 1,571 sampled parents, 405 parents of children with disabilities completed surveys for a response rate of 25.8%.  
  
Utilizing the numeric values assigned to responses, an average survey response was calculated for each respondent (numeric values were summed across items and were divided by the number of items to which each parent responded). Parents were identified as reporting “schools facilitated parental involvement” when the average response was greater than or equal to 4.000, as was used in previous administrations of the parent survey. Employing this standard for the analysis of the FFY 2019 survey data, 285 of 405 parents (70.37%) responding to the survey reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.  
  
Statistical analyses (t-tests or one-way ANOVAs, as appropriate) were conducted to determine if there were systematic differences in parent perceptions based on student age (3-5 years vs. 6-21 years), student race/ethnicity (students of color vs. white students), home language (English vs. not English), and primary disability classification (Autism Spectrum Disorders, Developmental Cognitive Disabilities, Emotional-Behavioral Disorders, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, Speech-Language Impairments, and all other disabilities combined into a “Low Incidence” category). One analysis was statistically significant: parents of students with Speech-Language Impairments gave a more positive or higher average survey response (mean=4.9) than did parents of students with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders (mean=4.1; p=0.01). None of the other statistical comparisons were statistically significant.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Minnesota’s overall process of survey administration and outreach strategies have proven successful in increasing response rates from typically underrepresented families and response rates overall. While the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on MDE’s ability to complete this year’s outreach activities, we will continue to implement and improve outreach efforts and work with districts to increase response rates for underrepresented families, especially families of color and whose home primary language is not English. In addition, MDE anticipates that the implementation of a new compliance monitoring and survey management system in FFY 2020 will provide LEAs more advanced notice of when they will participate in the annual survey. This information will help districts do advanced planning in anticipation of survey administration.

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

Representativeness of Survey Respondents   
  
The demographic representation of FFY 2019 survey respondents was examined using five demographic characteristics of students: their age, sex, federal race or ethnicity, home primary language (English, Hmong, Somali, Spanish, and Other), and primary disability classification (Autism Spectrum Disorders, Developmental Cognitive Disabilities, Emotional or Behavioral Disorders, Other Health Disabilities, Speech or Language Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and all other disability classifications grouped as ‘Low Incidence' disabilities). By utilizing logistic regression to analyze which students’ parents responded to the parent engagement survey, student characteristics associated with a statistically significant lower response rate were examined. Given that the overall sample is representative of the population of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in the state, an examination of the response rate by subgroup (responders vs. non-responders) sheds light on whether the survey responses received are representative of the state population.  
  
The results of the logistic regression indicated no statistically significant differences between families that did and did not respond to the survey with regard to age, sex, or home primary language. There were, however, statistically significant differences with regard to primary disability and student race or ethnicity. Families of students who are Black or Two or More Races responded to the survey at lower rates compared to survey non-responders. And, for primary disability, fewer families of students with Specific Learning Disabilities responded to the survey while more families of students with Other Health Disabilities and Autism Spectrum Disorders responded to the survey.   
  
Reliability Analysis  
  
In order to analyze the reliability of these data, a Cronbach’s Alpha analysis was conducted. This is a commonly used estimate of the internal consistency of a series of related items or questions; that is, Cronbach’s Alpha gives insight into how well the items in the survey are measuring the same concept or construct. Reliability estimates can range from 1.0 to 0.0 (zero): The closer the reliability is to 1 the higher the likelihood that the analyzed items measure the same concept or construct and the closer the reliability is to 0 (zero) the higher the likelihood that the items measure different concepts or constructs. The reliability estimates for the FFY 2019 parent engagement survey yielded an item reliability of 0.943 indicating that the survey has high level of reliability based on standards in current research.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

While the COVID-19 pandemic did not appear to impact the overall response rate to the survey, the pandemic did impact MDE’s ability to complete outreach activities to increase response rates for underrepresented families.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Please see information in the sections above in response to OSEP’s required actions.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

68

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 4 | 0 | 429 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

Methodology  
  
For FFY 2016 OSEP changed the requirements for calculating this indicator. The new language in the measurement table states that, “…if the State has established a minimum N-size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established N-size.” Upon review of Minnesota’s current calculation methodology it was determined that the methodology aligned with the new OSEP requirement but the description of the methodology has been updated to clarify the methodology and measurement steps. Minnesota has required a district to have a minimum N-size of 20 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest in order to be included in the methodology calculation. Minnesota will continue to use a minimum N-size of 20 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest for a district to be included in the calculation.   
  
Of Minnesota’s 497 districts in the 2019-20 school year, 68 did not meet the minimum enrollment criteria for any of the Indicator 9 disproportionate representation calculations (i.e., a minimum of 20 students in any of the seven (7) racial/ethnic group with IEPs). The remaining 429 districts met the minimum enrollment criteria for one or more Indicator 9 calculations.  
  
Measurement  
  
Percent = [(# of district s 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 that meth the State’s minimum N-size)] times 100.  
  
A district is considered to have overrepresentation of racial or ethnic groups in special education when the Risk Ratio and Weighted Risk Ratio are both greater than or equal to 2.8. When the comparison group is less than 10 students the Alternate Risk Ratio is used, as recommended by the IDEA Data Center Technical Assistance Guide.   
  
Definition of Disproportionate Representation  
  
Minnesota uses the Risk Ratio (RR), Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR), and Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) to determine which districts meet the data threshold for disproportionate representation. Risk Ratios compare the special education rates for one racial group with the special education rates for students of all other races in the district. The Weighted Risk Ratio adds an additional comparison with statewide racial group demographics. The Alternate Risk Ratio is used when districts have fewer than 10 students in the comparison group. The data threshold established for the state of Minnesota is as follows:  
  
Overrepresentation: (WRR > 2.8 and RR > 2.8) or ARR > 2.8 for students in the racial group if interest, minimum cell size of 20.  
  
Overview of Minnesota Procedures for Indicator 9  
  
Minnesota uses a four-phase process to address disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.  
  
Phase 1: Identification of Disproportionate Representation  
District-level Child Count data were used to identify instances of disproportionate representation that existed during the 2019-20 school year. Four (4) districts were identified for meeting the data threshold for Indicator 9 and moved forward to Phase 2.  
  
Phase 2: Determination of Inappropriate Identification  
Staff from the Division of Compliance and Assistance review the list of districts identified in Phase 1 and compare each district to its respective record review data consistent with the MDE monitoring cycle. Relevant citations are reviewed to identify whether any districts from the list were cited for inappropriate identification, then reviewed to identify districts cited for not using nondiscriminatory evaluation practices. In FFY 2019, none of the four (4) districts were cited for inappropriate identification; therefore, zero (0) districts that met the data threshold were identified as having inappropriate identification practices in FFY 2019. There were a total of 429 school districts that met the minimum N-size threshold and the resultant measurement for FFY 2019 is 0% (0/429 x 100). No districts advanced to Phase 3.   
  
Phase 3: District Self-Review and Correction  
Any district or districts identified in Phase 2 conduct a self-review of the data in Phase 1 and develop an improvement plan with technical assistance provided by MDE. In addition, districts complete a review of student records for due process compliance and correct any instances of noncompliance within one year.   
  
Phase 4: Validation of District Self-Review  
During the year a district is scheduled for an MDE Review, staff from the Division of Compliance and Assistance review the policies and procedures included in the district’s TSES and review district compliance data in the implementation of policies and procedures or practices. District compliance data are analyzed for patterns of noncompliance in identification and eligibility determination, selection of evaluation materials and procedures so as not to be discriminatory in evaluation practices. MDE further elicits interview data from the district special education administrative staff during the MDE Onsite Review year of the monitoring cycle, and determines the degree to which districts have implemented necessary staff development training for compliance with appropriate identification policies and procedures.

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

MDE conducted a review of the four (4) districts that met the threshold for overall disproportionate representation, by race or ethnicity, to determine whether they had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the disproportionate representation and that do not comply with requirements relating to the identification of students with disabilities or the development and implementation of IEPs. As a result of the review, none of the districts identified were found to have policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the disproportionate representation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting occurred prior to March 2020; therefore, this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

223

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 19 | 0 | 274 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

Methodology  
  
For FFY 2016 OSEP changed the requirements for calculating this indicator. The new language in the measurement table states that, “…if the State has established a minimum N-size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established N-size.” Upon review of Minnesota’s current calculation methodology, it was determined that the methodology aligned with the new OSEP requirement but the description of Minnesota’s activities has been updated to clarify the methodology and measurement steps. Minnesota has required a district to have a minimum N-size of 20 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest to be included in the methodology calculation. Minnesota will continue to use a minimum N-size of 20 children with IEPs in the race/ethnicity category of interest for a district to be included in the calculation.  
  
Of Minnesota’s 497 districts in the 2019-20 school year, 223 did not meet the minimum enrollment criteria for any Indicator 10 disproportionate representation calculations (i.e., a minimum of 20 students with IEPs in any of the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups). The remaining 274 districts met the minimum enrollment criteria for one of more Indicator 10 calculations.   
  
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. A district is considered to have overrepresentation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories when the Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) and the Risk Ratio (RR) are both greater than or equal to 3.0. When the comparison group is less than 10 students the Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) is used, as recommended by the IDEA Data Center Technical Assistance Guide.   
  
Definition of Disproportionate Representation  
  
Minnesota uses the Risk Ratio (RR) and Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) to determine which districts meet the data threshold for disproportionate representation. The Risk Ratio involves the comparison of special education rates for one racial group and the special education rates for students of all other races in the district. The Weighted Risk Ratio adds an additional comparison with statewide demographics. In addition to these measures, Minnesota uses the Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) when there are fewer than 10 students in the comparison group. Districts must meet the data threshold for both the WRR and the RR to be determined to have disproportionate representation. The data threshold established for the state of Minnesota is as follows:   
  
Overrepresentation: (WRR> 3.0 and RR > 3.0) or ARR > 3.0, for students in the racial group of interest, minimum N-size of 20.   
  
Overview of MDE Procedures for Indicator 10  
  
Minnesota utilizes a four phase process to address disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.   
  
Phase 1: Identification of Disproportionate Representation  
In examining disproportionate representation that existed during the 2019-20 school year, district Child Count data were used to calculate risk ratios using the data thresholds. Nineteen (19) districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for Indicator 10 and moved forward to Phase 2.   
  
Phase 2: Determination of Inappropriate Identification  
Staff from the Division of Compliance and Assistance review the list of districts identified in Phase 1 and compare each district to respective record review data consistent with the MDE monitoring cycle. Relevant citations are reviewed to identify whether any districts from the list were cited for inappropriate identification, then reviewed to identify districts cited for not using nondiscriminatory evaluation practices. In FFY 2019, none of the 19 identified districts was cited for inappropriate identification; therefore, zero (0) districts that met the data threshold were identified as having inappropriate identification practices in FFY 2018. There were a total of 274 school districts in Minnesota with the minimum N-size (20) for at least one calculation during FFY 2019 and the resultant measurement for FFY 2019 is 0% (0/274 x 100). No districts advanced to Phase 3.   
  
Phase 3: District Self-Review and Correction  
In Phase 3 districts identified through Phase 2 conduct a self-review of the data aggregated in Phase 1 and develop an improvement plan with technical assistance provided by MDE. In addition, districts complete a review of student records for due process compliance and correct any instances of noncompliance within one year.   
  
Phase 4: Validation of District Self-Review   
During the year a district is scheduled for an MDE Review, staff from the Division of Compliance and Assistance review the policies and procedures included in the district’s TSES and review district compliance data in the implementation of policies and procedures or practices. District compliance data re analyzed for patterns of noncompliance in identification and eligibility determination, selection of evaluation materials and procedures so as not to be discriminatory in evaluation practices. MDE further elicits interview data from the district special education administrative staff during the MDE Onsite Review year of the monitoring cycle and determines the degree to which districts have implemented necessary staff development training for compliance with appropriate identification policies and procedures.

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

MDE conducted a review of the 19 districts that met the threshold for overall disproportionate representation by race/ethnicity and disability type to determine whether the districts had policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the disproportionate representation and that do not comply with requirements relating to the identification of students with disabilities or the development and implementation of IEPs. As a result of the review, none of the districts identified were found to have policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the disproportionate representation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting occurred prior to March 2020; therefore, this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**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.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 94.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.04% | 97.52% | 98.14% | 96.28% | 96.31% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 450 | 430 | 96.31% | 100% | 95.56% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

20

**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.**

Those children included in (a) but not included in (b) were found to be in noncompliance for failure to complete the evaluation within 30 school days as required by Minnesota Rule. Citations were issued to LEAs for these 20 individual student records and correction has been tracked and verified by MDE.   
  
In FFY 2019, the range of days by which individual student records were found to be noncompliant ranged from 1 to 21 days late. Of the 20 noncompliant records: 7 (35%) were 1 or 2 days overdue; 4 (20%) were between 3 and 6 days overdue; and 3 (15%) were between 7 and 21 days overdue. For six records (30%), the length of delay could not be determined as the LEA did not maintain documentation of when parental consent to evaluate was received or of when the evaluation was due. All of the occurrences of individual student record noncompliance reported in this indicator were found to be out of compliance due to LEA issues. Some of the identified LEA issues included staffing shortages, staff absences or staff error.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

The state timeline for evaluations comes from Minnesota Rule 3525.2550 which states the team shall conduct an evaluation for special education purposes within a reasonable time not to exceed 30 school days from the date the district receives parental permission to conduct the evaluation or the expiration of the 14-calendar day parental response time in cases other than initial evaluation, unless a conciliation conference or hearing is requested.

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

State monitoring

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

Data for this indicator have been collected through MDE’s Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) which is the web-based data system used, in part, for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of LEAs through administrative units occurs on a six-year monitoring cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA, including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented CAPs. The sixth year of the cycle provides an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.   
  
As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent LEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the LEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race or ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.   
  
The FFY 2019 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 76 LEAs, comprised of 177 individual districts, including 44 Charter Schools and 27 Care and Treatment facilities. Data for this indicator are gathered from examining all the records with documented parental consent for an initial evaluation. Noncompliance is identified for this indicator if the evaluation was not completed within 30 school days from the date consent was received as required in Minn. R. 3525.2550, subp. 2(C).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data collection occurred through student record reviews conducted between September 15, 2019 and March 1, 2020, prior to the pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

LEAs with identified noncompliance are required to correct all individual student noncompliance, including Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) as necessary, with a subsequent review of student records, in order to demonstrate the LEA is now correctly implementing Minn. R. 3525.2550, subp. 2(C). As part of the CAP, the LEAs must track timelines for a minimum of three months to verify the LEA is in 100% compliance with the timeline. The LEAs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the student records that were reviewed, assuring that the LEA is now in compliance. All individual student noncompliance was corrected through the MNCIMP process. Most LEAs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 had only one or two records cited and the noncompliance was believed to be an isolated incident. Six LEAs were ordered CAPs for systemic noncompliance with this requirement. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent student record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the LEA as part of the CAP to verify that the LEAs are now correctly implementing Minn. R. 3525.2550, subp. 2(C). All six LEAs with CAPs successfully completed their CAPs within the required one year timeframe to demonstrate the LEA is in compliance and now correctly implementing the requirement.

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

All record review data from FFY 2018 was collected through MDE’s MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system which includes a compliance tracking system. For evaluation timelines, when record reviews are completed and data entered into the MNCIMP system, both the date the evaluation is due and the date the evaluation is completed are entered into the system. This allows MDE to verify that the evaluations have been completed, although they may have been late. If a date the evaluation was completed is missing, MDE requires the LEA to submit the Evaluation Report (ER) to demonstrate the evaluation has been completed, although late. If the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, the LEA must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the LEA from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all evaluations had been completed and each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was 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 determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 96.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 96.23% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 51 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 3 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 43 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 0 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. | 43 | 48 | 96.23% | 100% | 89.58% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Minnesota reports slippage on Indicator 12 from the FFY 2018 rate of 96.23% to the FFY 2019 rate of 89.58%. This represents a decrease of 6.56% and does not meet the FFY 2019 target of 100%. The FFY 2019 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 76 LEAs. In analyzing the identified noncompliance, it was found that five (5) of the LEAs reviewed were found to have noncompliance in this area. Each of the LEAs in noncompliance were found to have only one occurrence of individual student noncompliance in this area.   
  
MDE completed a thorough analysis of the noncompliance related to this indicator and believes that the noncompliance identified is relatively isolated in occurrence and not indicative of systemic noncompliance. Nonetheless, MDE is continuing to revise its data collection process and working on developing targeted technical assistance. Minnesota's Part C program falls under a birth mandate, providing all eligible children with special education and related services. Transition from Part C to Part B is relatively seamless in Minnesota. Part B and Part C early childhood staff typically also are housed together at the local level.

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

5

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

There were five (5) children that were served in Part C and referred to Part B that did not have eligibility determined and the IEP developed before their third birthdays. Two of those children had evaluations started, but the families moved outside of the district during the process so the evaluation was not completed by the district and no IEP was written. Two other children had the eligibility determination made by their third birthday, but the IEP was developed later; no explanation was provided by the district as to the delay. The fifth child had the eligibility determination made and IEP developed after their third birthday; again the district did not provide any explanation for the delay.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State monitoring

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

Data for this indicator have been collected through MDE’s Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) which is the web-based data system used, in part, for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of LEAs through administrative units occurs on a six-year monitoring cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA, including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented Corrective Action Plans (CAPs). The sixth year of the cycle provides an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.  
  
As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent LEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the LEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race or ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student.   
  
The FFY 2019 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 76 LEAs. Data for this indicator was taken from both Part B and Part C records for children that turned three during the reporting period. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and corresponding due process documentation were monitored to determine that legal standards were met. Noncompliance is identified for this indicator for children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who do not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data collection occurred through student record reviews conducted between September 15, 2019 and March 1, 2020, prior to the pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

LEAs with identified noncompliance are required to correct all individual student noncompliance, including develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), with a subsequent review of student records as necessary, in order to demonstrate the LEA is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The LEAs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the student records that were reviewed, assuring that the LEA is now in compliance. Most LEAs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 had only one record cited and the noncompliance was found to be an isolated incident. One LEA was ordered a CAP for systemic noncompliance with this indicator. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent student record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the LEA as part of a CAP to verify that the LEA is now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. Based on a review of the data, all of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected in FFY 2019.

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

All record review data from FFY 2018 were collected through MDE’s MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system which includes a compliance tracking system. For correction of noncompliance, the LEAs must submit documentation to MDE as demonstration of correction. Resubmission is required until the LEA can demonstrate correction. If the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, the LEA must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the LEA from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected in FFY 2019. MDE has since verified that all records with identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 were corrected and the LEAs are now in compliance or the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 58.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 88.30% | 88.40% | 89.53% | 79.73% | 91.99% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 347 | 414 | 91.99% | 100% | 83.82% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Minnesota reports slippage on Indicator 13 from the FFY 2018 rate of 91.99% to the FFY 2019 rate of 83.82%. This represents a decrease of 8.17% and does not meet the FFY 2019 target of 100%. Of the 414 records of individuals age 16 and above that were reviewed in FFY 2019, 347 were found in compliance with this indicator. As noted, this represents overall slippage from FFY 2018 when 356 of 387 records were found in compliance. While more records were reviewed in FFY 2019 than in FFY 2018, the overall slippage is concerning.  
  
An analysis of the noncompliance from FFY 2019 identified a total of 26 LEAs with noncompliance related to this indicator. Approximately 65% of the LEAs identified noncompliance in only one or two student records. A couple of LEAs had a total of three records identified with noncompliance, but these LEAs are cooperatives made up of several smaller districts; none of the individual districts in these cooperatives had more than one record identified with noncompliance related to this indicator. When compared to the number of files reviewed for this indicator per district, the rate of noncompliance per district or per LEA was generally fairly small. While the numbers add up to a significant share of noncompliance overall, the majority of the LEAs appear to have relatively isolated incidents of noncompliance. LEAs were ordered Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) to address systemic noncompliance with this indicator. Approximately 62% of those LEAs had noncompliance identified in only one or two of the eight areas measured in this indicator. Only two LEAs had more than two records identified as noncompliant in any one area. One of those LEAs was a very large metro area district and the other was a very large cooperative made up of many individual districts. None of those individual districts had more than one citation in any one area.   
  
The greatest area of noncompliance was with IEPs not including appropriate measurable postsecondary goals. This was found noncompliant in approximately 7% of the total records reviewed and was identified as noncompliant in almost 45% of the noncompliant records. IEPs not including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals was also a concern. This was found noncompliant in approximately 5% of the total records reviewed and was identified as noncompliant in almost 30% of the noncompliant records. Postsecondary goals not being based upon an age appropriate transition assessments was cited in 4.6% of the total records reviewed for this indicator and failure to update the IEP annually was evident in 4.3% of the records. Analysis of the data again shows that most LEAs identified only one or two records as noncompliant in any one of the eight areas.   
  
There were 17 LEAs identified with noncompliance related to IEPs not including appropriate measurable postsecondary goals. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the LEAs had only one or two student records identified with noncompliance in this area. Those LEAs with three or more records identified with noncompliance tended either to be large LEAs or cooperatives with multiple districts. Those cooperatives identified with multiple citations generally had only one or two individual citations per individual school district. In regards to the IEP not including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals, 10 LEAs were identified with noncompliance in this area. Eight (8) of the 10 LEAs with identified noncompliance only had noncompliance in one or two records. One of the two LEAs with multiple instances of noncompliance is a very large cooperative with many individual districts. None of the individual districts had more than one record cited for noncompliance in this area. Postsecondary goals not being based upon an age appropriate transition assessments was identified as noncompliant in nine (9) LEAs. Eight (8) of those nine (9) LEAs had noncompliance in only one or two records. And while LEAs continue to struggle with meeting the annual review of the IEP requirements, an analysis of the data for this indicator shows that of the 13 LEAs with noncompliance, approximately 85% only had one or two records identified as noncompliant in this area.   
  
MDE has done a thorough analysis of the noncompliance related to this indicator and believes that the majority of the noncompliance is relatively isolated in occurrence and not indicative of systemic noncompliance in most cases. The data does show there are some LEAs that continue to struggle with the requirements and MDE continues to develop new targeted technical assistance to address the requirements for this indicator. For the past several years, MDE has provided training on all Indicator 13 requirements through record review compliance training and general compliance training of new special education staff offered by the division of Compliance and Assistance. MDE’s division of Special Education also has doubled the community teams working in Employment Capacity Building strategies cohorts as well as piloting initiatives around pre-employment transition services. MDE will continue to develop additional training modules to specifically address secondary transition requirements and will continue to train on all of the requirements related to Indicator 13.

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

State monitoring

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

Data for this indicator have been collected through MDE’s Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) which is the web-based data system used, in part, for gathering data from record reviews completed as part of compliance monitoring. Compliance monitoring of LEAs through administrative units occurs on a six-year monitoring cycle. In year one of the cycle, the LEA conducts a self-review of records. In year two, the LEA must demonstrate correction of any noncompliance identified in the self-review consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. In year three, MDE conducts an on-site review of the LEA including a review of student records, facilities and the LEA’s Total Special Education System (TSES). In year four of the cycle, the LEA must demonstrate correction of noncompliance identified during the MDE review and implement any corrective action, again consistent with the requirements set forth in OSEP Memo 09-02. The fifth year of the cycle is used to verify results of the implemented Corrective Action Plans (CAPs). The sixth year of the cycle provides an additional year for LEAs to implement corrective action and changes to their systems prior to the start of the new monitoring cycle and self-review of records.  
  
As part of the record review, a computer-generated sample is used to determine the student records to be reviewed. Records are selected from the most recent LEA enrollment data and are chosen in order to be accurately representative of the LEA as a whole. Selection is based on a stratified random sampling with consideration given to race/ethnicity, age, gender, and primary disability of the student. During the record review, the most current Evaluation Report (ER), Individualized Education Program (IEP) and corresponding due process documentation are monitored to determine that legal standards are met.   
  
The data collection methods used in FFY 2019 are consistent with those used in compilation of FFY 2009 revised baseline data through FFY 2018 data, and allow for a valid comparison of percentages between these years. The FFY 2019 data are based on MDE reviews and LEA self-review of 76 LEAs, comprised of 177 individual districts, including 44 Charter Schools and 27 Care and Treatment facilities.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | NO |

**If no, please explain**

Minnesota has elected to not include students younger than age 16 in the calculation for this indicator in order to maintain consistency and allow for better comparison between current and past year data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The data collection for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Data collection occurred through student record reviews conducted between September 15, 2019 and March 1, 2020, prior to the pandemic.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

LEAs with identified noncompliance are required to correct all individual student noncompliance, including develop Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), with a subsequent review of student records as necessary, in order to demonstrate the LEA is now correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The LEAs submit Letters of Assurance along with information on the student records that were reviewed, assuring that the LEA is now in compliance. Most LEAs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 had only one or two records cited and the noncompliance was believed to be an isolated incident. Six LEAs were ordered CAPs to address systemic noncompliance with this requirement. MDE has reviewed additional data from subsequent student record reviews conducted as part of an on-site review by MDE or by the LEA as part of a CAP to verify that the LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR §§ 300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Based on a review of the data, all of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected in FFY 2019.

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

All record review data from FFY 2018 were collected through MDE’s MNCIMP web-based data system. Once noncompliance is identified, it is tracked through the same web-based data system which includes a compliance tracking system. For correction of noncompliance, the LEAs must submit documentation to MDE as demonstration of correction. Resubmission is required until the LEA can demonstrate correction. If the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, the LEA must submit to MDE the reason (moved, for example) and the date of the occurrence to release the LEA from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected in FFY 2019. MDE has since verified that all records with identified noncompliance in FFY 2018 were corrected and the LEAs are now in compliance or the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**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.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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

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

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2013 | Target >= | 25.00% | 25.40% | 25.80% | 26.20% | 26.60% |
| A | 23.39% | Data | 29.31% | 24.86% | 23.24% | 27.14% | 24.49% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 66.00% | 66.40% | 66.80% | 67.20% | 67.60% |
| B | 61.90% | Data | 70.53% | 69.25% | 61.71% | 65.67% | 58.75% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 78.30% | 78.70% | 79.10% | 79.50% | 79.90% |
| C | 77.60% | Data | 84.54% | 86.78% | 81.14% | 80.05% | 73.62% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 26.60% |
| Target B >= | 67.60% |
| Target C >= | 79.90% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 427 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 106 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 155 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 18 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 48 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 106 | 427 | 24.49% | 26.60% | 24.82% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 261 | 427 | 58.75% | 67.60% | 61.12% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 327 | 427 | 73.62% | 79.90% | 76.58% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

The OSEP approved sampling frame has been extended to the current SPP/APR. In 2005, all Minnesota school districts and charter schools were assigned to one of five groups to participate in the Minnesota Post-School Outcomes Follow-Up Survey on a five year cycle. Districts were divided so that each of the five groups represented the state at large, a sampling frame approved by OSEP. Since the first year of data collection in the 2006-07 school years, MDE has continued to survey a representative sample of districts. Because of fluctuations in the numbers of charter schools, adjustments are made to the sample when charter schools either open or close. Since charter schools enroll a relatively small proportion of Minnesota students, especially the group of “leavers” on which this indicator is focused, the overall representativeness of each year’s group is not affected.  
  
In FFY 2019, a total of 58 districts were included in the post-school outcomes survey sampling frame, with 44 districts that had student “leavers” who participated in the survey. Each year, the entire census of leavers with IEPs that are in the sampled districts are surveyed. Leavers are not sampled, districts are sampled. Districts included in the sample were given the student names, demographic information, and special education placement in the student’s last year of school participation. In mid-April 2020, staff from sampled districts were provided detailed information and directions about how to complete the survey process. District special education directors were responsible for oversight of their district’s survey completion. Out of a total of 1,183 students, 443 completed surveys for a response rate of 37%. District personnel attempted to contact an additional 615 students but were unsuccessful in reaching them. Fourteen (14) districts did not submit any completed surveys, accounting for 125 additional students. MDE staff made repeated contacts with the districts to provide technical assistance with data collection completion. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on district staffing capacity, MDE extended the survey completion deadline one month. Top reasons districts reported as being unable to complete survey interviews with students included not being able to make contact with the student, the most recent phone number was disconnected, or students were not interested in participating in the survey.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | YES |
| If yes, attach a copy of the survey | 2020 Post School Outcome Survey Final for FFY 2019 APR Submission |

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

Minnesota’s school and charter districts are assigned to one of five groups to participate in the Post-School Outcomes Survey (PSOS) on a five-year cycle. From the group of districts identified in each cycle, all students who are one year post leaving high school are invited to complete the survey. In general, the student demographics of the five district groups closely resembles the state population with regard to race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the state.  
  
To determine whether the students who responded to the PSOS were representative of all students in the survey group, Minnesota compared the rate of survey responders to non-responders using federal race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location. There were some areas that were statistically significant difference between survey responders and non-responders for federal race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location. Specifically, more students who were White responded to the survey than all other student race/ethnicity groups and fewer students who were Black responded to the survey than all other student race/ethnicity groups. In addition, there were more students identified with Developmental Cognitive Disabilities responding to the survey than students in all other disability designations and fewer students identified with Emotional or Behavioral Disorders or Autism Spectrum Disorders responding to the survey than students in all other disability designations. Finally, there were more survey responders from state regions 3, 6, 8, and 10 (mostly areas of greater Minnesota) than regions 9 and 11 (areas in south central Minnesota and the Twin Cities metro), with students in the Twin Cities metro area responding to the survey at relatively lower rates compared to their peers in other areas of the state.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

While the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on districts’ ability to complete this year’s survey, there continue to be opportunities for MDE to work with districts to improve student participation in the PSOS to ensure that respondents are representative of students who left high school the year prior to survey administration. In anticipation of a new compliance monitoring and survey management system for FFY 2020, MDE will be able to provide LEAs more advanced notice of when they will participate in the annual survey. This information will help districts do advanced planning in anticipation of survey administration. In addition, MDE will continue to work with districts to review methods used to ensure student contact information is current and outreach strategies used to connect with students. MDE also solicits ongoing feedback from districts and other stakeholders for ways to improve PSOS participation.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on both districts’ capacity to complete outreach activities required to complete surveys as well as student response rates to the survey.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Please see information in the sections above in response to OSEP’s required actions.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## 14 - State Attachments



# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 11 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 4 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 9.09% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 10.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 15.00% - 20.00% | 20.00% - 25.00% |
| Data | 40.00% | 10.53% | 9.09% | 33.33% | 33.33% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 20.00% | 25.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | 11 | 33.33% | 20.00% | 25.00% | 36.36% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 27 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 25 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In Minnesota, the development of the SPP/APR involves review and input from broadly representative groups of internal and external stakeholders. The primary advisory group for the SPP/APR is the Minnesota Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The membership of SEAP is representative of stakeholders in Minnesota and includes parents of children with disabilities, representatives from school districts, legal advocates, parent advocates, representatives from disability specific organizations and institutions of higher education. Its mission is to provide guidance to MDE about the education of students with disabilities and the policies, procedures and activities developed and implemented by MDE. The members of SEAP are appointed by the Governor’s office through the Commissioner of Education. Other stakeholder groups, such as the Special Education Directors’ Forum, The Governor’s Developmental Disabilities Council, Minnesota Administrators for Special Educators, Higher Education Forum, PACER Center, The Arc of Minnesota, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness also play an integral part in the review of MDE issues, policies and activities, and their input is incorporated in the SPP/APR. MDE sought input from various groups at multiple points throughout the development of this SPP/APR. MDE staff reviewed OSEP requirements, reviewed recent changes to data methodology, reviewed and analyzed state data, identified new and ongoing improvement activities, and presented them in multiple meetings to prepare the SPP/APR.  
  
With the development of a new SPP in 2014, MDE Special Education Division staff, through various workgroups, took the opportunity to carefully consider the new OSEP requirements, review historical and current data, and make recommendations for the new plan. The changes were presented to SEAP multiple times, where discussions focused on reporting changes, student outcomes, and potential areas of concern. Other discussions with SEAP occurred in the areas of student discipline, parent involvement, post-school outcomes, transition, and compliance monitoring. For each indicator, SEAP provided specific recommendations for changes, discussed progress or slippage, identified promising practices for improvement and provided input into new targets where applicable. In addition, SEAP was informed of potential issues and continuing improvements to MDE data collection systems. In the years following, MDE has implemented the same process with SEAP, providing regular updates and opportunities for input and discussion regarding new changes to indicator data reporting, recommendations for changes to baselines or targets, and data outcomes.  
  
Providing multiple opportunities for stakeholder review and input continues to be a priority for MDE. With COVID-19 health guidelines, all SEAP meetings since March 2020 have been virtual, and access to the public through this format has been maintained. In addition to a formal review by SEAP, the information contained in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR was shared with or reviewed by multiple internal administrative and advisory representatives, local Directors of Special Education, and disability-specific interest and advocacy groups. The FFY 2019 SPP/APR will be made available to the general public on the MDE website and is communicated annually through a broad array of web-based and other agency communication networks. MDE will link reports to the Office of Special Education Programs’ SPP/APR public reporting website so the final document is accessible to a general audience. The public availability of information contained in the APR further enables stakeholders to provide feedback to MDE and examine state and district level performance.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 71.43% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 75.00% - 80.00% | 75.00% - 80.00% | 80.00% - 90.00% | 80.00% - 90.00% | 80.00% - 90.00% |
| Data | 81.25% | 96.88% | 92.68% | 84.62% | 91.67% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 80.00% | 90.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 25 | 27 | 91.67% | 80.00% | 90.00% | | 92.59% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data collection and reporting for this indicator was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Carolyn Cherry

**Title:**

Supervisor, Results & Improvement/Part B Data Manager

**Email:**

carolyn.cherry@state.mn.us

**Phone:**

651-582-8509

**Submitted on:**

04/22/21 11:09:32 PM

# ED Attachments



1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)