Monitoring Priorities and Indicators		Statı	us of APR	Data/SPP	Revision l	ssues		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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]	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 52.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 48.5%.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.			
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]	and OSEP The State's represent 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 7.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 12.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 13.8%.				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, FFY 2005 progress data and progress data from FFY 2006. The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	and OSEP	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:				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating		
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.	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data Reading	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data Math	FFY 2006 Target	improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
[Results Indicator]	Elem	30%	96.7%	69%	93.3%	100%	69%	
	Middle	35.7%	93.3%	43%	33.3%	80%	51%	
	High	0%	33.3%	43%	0%	33.3%	20%	
	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator represent progress from the FFY 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.							

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues						OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	and OSEP	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:					OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.	
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. [Results Indicator]	Elem Middle High These data FFY 2005	data.	C	•	•	FFY 2006 Data Math 98.73% 97.76% 95.25% ppage in p	FFY 2006 Target 100% 100% art from the	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	and OSEP	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:				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY		
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	Grade Elem Middle High These data The State r				FFY 2005 Data 40.6% 17.6% 15.1% 2005 data	FFY 2006 Data Math 61.6% 29.6% 19.8%	FFY 2006 Target 36.5% 37.75% 46.5%	2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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 [Results Indicator]	The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.	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, that it reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards: (1) for the two districts it identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004 APR; and (2) for any districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. 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).
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.	
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. [Results Indicator]		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SP		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps		
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:	The State revised its improvement activity OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to			
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;	The State's reported data for this indicato	T	•	, ,	the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006	2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.54%	57.32%	Target > 57%	
placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.15%	8.62%	< 9.52%	
[Results Indicator]	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.63%	2.76%	< 2.45%	
	These data represent progress in 5A and 5B and slippage in 5C from the FFY 2005 data.				
	The State met its FFY 2006 targets in 5A 2006 target for 5C.	and 5B but	t did not me	eet its FFY	
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).	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required	I for the FF	'Y 2006 AP	R.	
[Results Indicator]					

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps			
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress dat	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State			
improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	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.
knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	3.9%	3.9%	9.8%	
early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	13.7%	19.6%	15.7%	
[Results Indicator; New]	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	25.5%	29.4%	15.7%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	29.4%	21.6%	27.5%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	27.5%	25.5%	31.4%	
	The State provided improvement activities remaining years of the SPP.				
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.	The State revised the improvement activitie and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this for school age and preschool respectively. If from the FFY 2005 data of 51.9% and 70.20. The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 52.15.	indicator These data %.	are 58.6% represent	and 76.5% progress	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 revised sampling plan prior to, or with the February 1, 2007 FFY 2005 APR submission. WDE submitted its revised sampling plan with its FFY 2006
[Results Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 52.15% for school age and 70.7% for preschool.				APR. The State's sampling plan has been approved.
					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the calculation used to report on this indicator and recalculated their baseline. The baseline remained unchanged. The State also revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the calculation used to report on this indicator and recalculated their baseline. The baseline remained unchanged. The State also revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%. The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]	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 75.8% and 97% for school aged and preschool respectively. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 74.5% and 93.6% for school aged and preschool respectively. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 100%.	The State must clarify in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State ensures the correction of any noncompliance, notwithstanding the extent of the noncompliance. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Under Indicator 15, the State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported it has compliance agreements in place in the three districts that had uncorrected findings resulting from the 2005-2006 monitoring visits. In its FFY 2006 APR, the State indicated that districts whose level of compliance was above 95% would not be required to complete a corrective action plan. While the State may take into account the extent of the noncompliance in determining what corrective action is needed, the State must ensure the correction of any noncompliance, notwithstanding the extent of the noncompliance.	§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. 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.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 68.29%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. Under Indicator 15, the State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in the five Child Development Centers monitored in FFY 2005, including findings related to Indicator 12, were corrected in a timely manner.	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. 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.
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.	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 62.51%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 50.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that nine of 41 LEAs identified as out of compliance with this indicator in FFY 2005 corrected the noncompliance in a timely	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR \$300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected. The State must review its improvement

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that compliance letters would be written requiring each of the remaining 32 districts to attend targeted transition professional development activities to increase the knowledge and capacity of district staff developing transition plans for students with disabilities.	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.
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. [Results Indicator; New]	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 83.5%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.67% and 100% for its school age and preschool entities respectively. OSEP calculated the data for this indicator to be 75%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it has compliance agreements in place in the three districts that had uncorrected findings resulting from the 2005-2006 monitoring visits.	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. 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 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. In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps indicators.
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]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three complaints and remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
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]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that two of two resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that the one mediation held resulted in a mediation agreement. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	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 93.3%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 92.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	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).