

Florida 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 baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it received input from the State Advisory Committee and the multi-agency indicator workgroup on these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 39.9%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 39.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 39.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 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 5.39%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 5.52%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 4.25%.</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>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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4% for reading and 10% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 6% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 31% for reading and 26% for math.</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>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.5% for reading and math combined.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 93.8% for reading and math combined.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 29.9% for reading and 32.4% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 27.7% for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 29.5% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 33% for reading and 35% for math.</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>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 19.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 11.9%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to 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 LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004, 2005, and 2006 APR. The State provided the required information, including the identification and partial correction of noncompliance related to procedural safeguards and the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports.</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).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<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 separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</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 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 781 1419 1161"> <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 than 21% of the day.</td> <td>54.4%</td> <td>57.9%</td> <td>54.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>23.2%</td> <td>21.5%</td> <td>23.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>3.0%</td> <td>1.8%</td> <td>2.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54.4%	57.9%	54.8%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	23.2%	21.5%	23.3%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.0%	1.8%	2.7%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54.4%	57.9%	54.8%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	23.2%	21.5%	23.3%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.0%	1.8%	2.7%															
<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</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
special education settings). [Results Indicator]																										
<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> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 399 1419 1081"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 399 1047 573">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1047 399 1180 573">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 399 1299 573">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 399 1419 573">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 573 1047 643">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 573 1180 643">2.9%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 573 1299 643">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 573 1419 643">1.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 643 1047 776">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 643 1180 776">17.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 643 1299 776">34%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 643 1419 776">29.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 776 1047 878">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 776 1180 878">16.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 776 1299 878">29.1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 776 1419 878">17.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 878 1047 980">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 878 1180 980">32%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 878 1299 980">26.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 878 1419 980">24.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 980 1047 1081">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 980 1180 1081">31.1%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 980 1299 1081">10.7%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 980 1419 1081">27.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.9%	0%	1.9%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	17.5%	34%	29.2%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	16.5%	29.1%	17.5%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32%	26.2%	24.3%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.1%	10.7%	27.2%	<p>The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it will yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</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>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.9%	0%	1.9%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	17.5%	34%	29.2%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	16.5%	29.1%	17.5%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32%	26.2%	24.3%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.1%	10.7%	27.2%																							

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 its targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The targets were revised to be less rigorous and Florida's State Advisory Committee provided input.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 30%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 29%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 31%.</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 surveys as required by the instructions for the SPP/APR. 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>
<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 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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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 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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data are not valid or reliable because the State did not provide a percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification consistent with the measurement. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data based on the proper measure for this indicator. The State was also required to submit data and information demonstrating that it examined data for all race and ethnicity categories in the State in all districts to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State did not provide the required information.</p> <p>For both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 the State</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>reported that it compiled risk ratios for the six specific disability categories and determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories occurred in only the white and black student groups.</p> <p>For FFY 2005, the State reported a duplicate number of districts with disproportionate representation of white and black students in specific disability categories. However, the State did not determine whether the disproportionate representation of white and black students in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification for each district. Rather, the State reported that, in order to prioritize technical assistance efforts, the State selected only those districts with disproportionate representation of students in both mental retardation and emotional disturbance to determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in these disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>For FFY 2006, the State reported a duplicated number of districts with disproportionate representation of white and black students in specific disability categories. The State reported that in order to prioritize technical assistance efforts, the State utilized a tiered approach to determine if disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification, and based on this approach selected 53 districts to determine the tier of intervention the district would receive from the State. The State reported that it added one district to this review from the previous year and reported that the State had determined that</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in this district was not the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>It is unclear to OSEP what the State means by utilizing a “tiered approach.” It appears that the “tiered approach” described by the State to analyze its FFY 2006 data is the same approach the State used to analyze FFY 2005 data. Regardless, the State did not determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification for <u>all</u> districts identified with disproportionate representation of any racial or ethnic group in any of the specific disability categories.</p> <p>Florida may target its technical assistance to maximize the use of the State’s resources. However, for every school district in which the State identifies disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, the State must annually determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification, and make that determination for all racial and ethnic groups and for all disability categories in which disproportionate representation has been identified.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that it has examined all districts in which the State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and determined whether the disproportionate representation of racial and</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>ethnic groups in specific disability categories is a result of inappropriate identification. The State must make that determination for FFYs 2005, 2006 and 2007 and report the results of those determinations in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, if the State identifies any districts as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on data for FFYs 2005 and FFY 2006, the State must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified 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 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 93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 92%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within the State established timeline.</p> <p>The State reported that three of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it scheduled targeted on-site monitoring to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State must submit the data regarding the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within the State established timeline, which is required in the measurement for this indicator, with the 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance 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</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		§300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<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 implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance 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 68.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 32%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide data on the number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services and information on the reasons for the delays beyond the third birthday. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>Additionally, the State was required to report on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. The State did not report that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 was corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance 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 2005 and FFY 2006 APRs.</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>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 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 61%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 24 of 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<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 those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 55.2%.</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 the language in its targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 90%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 75 of 89 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that 11 of the remaining findings have since been corrected. For the 3 remaining uncorrected findings of noncompliance, the State reported plans for on-site monitoring visits and targeted technical assistance related to drop-out prevention and disciplinary procedures for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2005 SPP/APR response table required to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data demonstrating that the State collapsed its targets for complaints, due process, mediation, etc. into one target. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, 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 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 11, 12,</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		and 13 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50%. 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 its targets to improve from the 2006-07 data and revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 52%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 57%.</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 resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The targets for FFY 2007 and beyond were revised to include a target range. The State reported that its stakeholders concurred with the revision to the targets. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it 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>