

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 70% of districts that met or exceeded graduation benchmarks. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 90% of districts that met or exceeded graduation benchmarks.</p> <p>The State's reported 618 data, due on November 1, 2007, for FFY 2006 are 55.22% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. The State's reported 618 data for FFY 2005 are 60% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96% of districts that met or exceeded established annual benchmarks for drop out. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 86% of districts that met or exceeded established annual benchmarks for drop out.</p> <p>The State's reported 618 data, due on November 1, 2007, for FFY 2006 are 20.85% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. The State's reported 618 data for FFY 2005 are 32% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 35.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 53.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 54%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, raw data, the minimum "n" size data, and the number of districts that met the "n" size. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps							
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.3% for English language arts (ELA) and 96.4% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 96.5% for ELA and remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 96.4% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 95% for ELA and met its FFY 2006 target of 95% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 2, 2007 verification letter required the State to submit by June 1, 2007 documentation that it was meeting the requirement at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D)(1) (and 34 CFR §300.160) requiring public reporting of the participation rates of students taking the regular assessment with accommodations. The State reported in a letter dated May 30, 2007 that "CDE is exploring the addition of data regarding the number of students provided accommodations to the School Accountability Report Card." In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide documentation that it reports to the public the number of children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate in regular assessments, with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports assessment results for children without disabilities, as required by 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D)(i) and 34 CFR §300.160.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>							
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1369 1419 1487"> <tr> <td></td> <td>FFY 2005 Data</td> <td>FFY 2006 Data</td> <td>FFY 2006 Target</td> <td>FFY 2005 Data</td> <td>FFY 2006 Data</td> <td>FFY 2006 Target</td> </tr> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target			

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
[Results Indicator]	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 233 1423 513"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">ELA</th> <th colspan="3">Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td> <td>19.6%</td> <td>20.8%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>22.4%</td> <td>24.3%</td> <td>23.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elem, Mid</td> <td>20.8%</td> <td>22.7%</td> <td>24.4%</td> <td>24.8%</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>26.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS 9-12</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>22.3%</td> <td>14.8%</td> <td>17.1%</td> <td>20.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="548 532 1423 597">These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.</p>								ELA			Math			Unified, HS 7-12, COE	19.6%	20.8%	23%	22.4%	24.3%	23.7%	Elem, Mid	20.8%	22.7%	24.4%	24.8%	26.6%	26.5%	HS 9-12	16.7%	16.3%	22.3%	14.8%	17.1%	20.9%	
	ELA			Math																																
Unified, HS 7-12, COE	19.6%	20.8%	23%	22.4%	24.3%	23.7%																														
Elem, Mid	20.8%	22.7%	24.4%	24.8%	26.6%	26.5%																														
HS 9-12	16.7%	16.3%	22.3%	14.8%	17.1%	20.9%																														
<p data-bbox="90 634 522 695">4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p data-bbox="90 716 522 914">A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p data-bbox="90 935 312 963">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 634 1423 695">The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 716 1423 813">The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 10.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 17.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 10.4%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 834 1423 1062">The State reported under this indicator that for the noncompliance identified based on FFY 2005 data, all of the systemic findings were closed and that three student-specific complaints are still open pending completion of compensatory services. The State reported under Indicator 15, that of 86 monitoring findings related to this Indicator, 68 were timely corrected, but did not report any FFY 2005 findings made under dispute resolution mechanisms such as complaints.</p>							<p data-bbox="1453 634 1997 1198">OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of its review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 for the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided information showing that districts identified in FFY 2005 conducted the required review, and that 18 of the 88 districts identified in FFY 2006 had conducted the required review.</p> <p data-bbox="1453 1219 1997 1284">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p data-bbox="1453 1305 1997 1463">The State reported that noncompliance, identified in FFY 2005 as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due</p>																												

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
		<p>February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 for the remaining LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006.</p>								
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>									
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1328 1419 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less</td> <td>50.4%</td> <td>49.5%</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less	50.4%	49.5%	53%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target							
A. Removed from regular class less	50.4%	49.5%	53%							

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>than 21% of the day.</p>				
	<p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p>	<p>24.2%</p>	<p>25.6%</p>	<p>23%</p>	
	<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>4.3%</p>	<p>4.1%</p>	<p>4.2%</p>	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5C and slippage for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.</p>				
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>				<p>The State reported that it will be using a census approach to collecting data for this indicator in future years.</p> <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	<p>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p>Social Emotional</p>	<p>Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p>Appropriate Behavior</p>	
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p>14%</p>	<p>8%</p>	<p>17%</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>21%</p>	<p>20%</p>	<p>17%</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p>14%</p>	<p>18%</p>	<p>12%</p>	

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	6%	7%	4%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	45%	47%	50%	
	The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87.81%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 74%.</p>				<p>The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. The sampling plan is currently under review, and OSEP will respond under separate cover.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2006 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.19%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 1.95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 of 15 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification were in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the determination of "with large enough student populations." The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification regarding how practices are reviewed when determining whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups is the result of inappropriate</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>§§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>	<p>identification. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173, and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 11.07%. However, the State has not completed its review of policies, procedures and practices to determine if districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification. Of the 583 districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, 150 have completed a review of policies, procedures and practices related to identification. Therefore, these data are not valid and reliable.</p> <p>As noted above, the State’s data for this indicator are not valid and reliable and, as noted below, the State has not reported complete FFY 2005 baseline data. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not submit the required information. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State reported that 625 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in FFY 2005. The State further reported that it has not been able to complete a review of policies, procedures and practices related to identification and that this review will be completed in the spring and fall of 2008, with results being reported in the FFY 2007 APR due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that 649 of 793 findings for Indicators 9 and 10 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were subsequently corrected.</p>	<p>description and report on the revisions it has made and the results of its review of data and information for all race and ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported on the results of its review to identify districts with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, noting that the review to determine whether each district with disproportionate representation in FFY 2006 had not yet been completed. In its FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide revised FFY 2006 data regarding the number and percent of districts with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected, but as noted previously, the State has not completed its review based on the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1,</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2009, demonstrating that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173, and that the LEAs identified based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data as having disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it has a new State-defined timeline for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 71.6% based on monitoring data. This represents slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 82.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 461 of 471 student level findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining ten findings were corrected in more than one year. The State did not provide information regarding the <u>timely</u> correction of the 254 districts with findings reported in FFY 2005, but did report that all findings of noncompliance were corrected by February 1, 2008.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data regarding the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69.19%. The State did</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data regarding the number of children</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 of 24 systemic findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was corrected 90 days beyond the one-year timeline. The State reported that there were an additional seven districts with systemic findings of noncompliance in FFY 2005 that were not reported in the FFY 2005 APR. The State reported that six of seven systemic findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was corrected 27 days after the one year timeline.</p>	<p>referred from Part C to Part B who were determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility determinations were made prior to their third birthdays, the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delay. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not use the required measurement for this indicator in collecting the FFY 2005 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 89 of 109 student level findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining student level findings were corrected by February 1, 2008. The State reported that all 13 findings of systemic noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected by February 1, 2008, but did not report how many were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a clarification as to why the reported FFY 2005 data were consistent with the required measurement for this indicator, or provide data that are consistent with the measurement. The State provided FFY 2006 data that are consistent with the measurement.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>§300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 69.25%.</p> <p>Although the State reported using census data, the State only provided data for 112 of 115 SELPAs.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State's definitions for postsecondary education and competitive employment. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must include data from all SELPAs in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, or explain why data for the three SELPAs were excluded from the census data.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its measurement for this indicator and added improvement activities in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.12%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 97.18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 21,299 of 23,633 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by February 1, 2008.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data disaggregated by APR indicator regarding the status of timely correction of noncompliance findings identified by the State in FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 33%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 58%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 62%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that</p>	<p>The State revised targets and improvement activities for this indicator in</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data</p>

California Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 43%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 57%.</p>	<p>demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.3%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 91.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>