

Alabama's 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 32.54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 29.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 31.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.¹</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4.40%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 4.15%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 73%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

¹ OSEP notes that the targets that the State has established for Indicators 1, 3C, 5A and 14 are stated as a percentage increase, and in the case of Indicators 2 and 5B and 5C, a percentage decrease, from the prior year's performance. It is OSEP's understanding that the State intends that each of these targets means that the State will be able to report improvement in performance over the six year period of the SPP. The State must ensure that, notwithstanding the performance level the State reports for these indicators in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, its targets in the State's FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, reflect improvement from the State's FFY 2004 baseline for Indicators 1, 2, 3C and 5, and the FFY 2006 baseline for Indicator 14.

Alabama's 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 99%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 99%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 36%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 34.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 38.8%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 13%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 14%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 11%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to clarify, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, whether it reviews the policies, procedures, and practices in the areas identified in 34 CFR §300.170(b), for all LEAs, and not just those LEAs selected for focused monitoring, identified as having significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities. The State clarified in the FFY 2006 APR that it reviews the policies, procedures, and</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>practices for all LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table also 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 2005 APR. The State provided the required description for those LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities identified in the FFY 2005 APR.</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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																
<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 targets for Indicator 5C and one improvement activity for Indicator 5 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="548 914 1419 1295"> <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>67.05%</td> <td>74.06%</td> <td>68.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>6.61%</td> <td>6.12%</td> <td>6.51%.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.77%</td> <td>2.75%</td> <td>1.77%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for Indicators 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for Indicator 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	67.05%	74.06%	68.05%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.61%	6.12%	6.51%.	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.77%	2.75%	1.77%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance for 5A and 5B and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance for 5C 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 than 21% of the day.	67.05%	74.06%	68.05%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.61%	6.12%	6.51%.															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.77%	2.75%	1.77%															

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<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 provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1419 1417"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 732 1062 906">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 732 1182 906">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 732 1299 906">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 732 1419 906">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 906 1062 976">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 906 1182 976">1.3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 906 1299 976">3.3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 906 1419 976">1.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 976 1062 1110">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 976 1182 1110">4.3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 976 1299 1110">7.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 976 1419 1110">4.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1110 1062 1213">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1110 1182 1213">12.9%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1110 1299 1213">25.2%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1110 1419 1213">9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1213 1062 1315">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1213 1182 1315">26%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1213 1299 1315">33.8%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1213 1419 1315">19.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1315 1062 1417">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1315 1182 1417">55.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1315 1299 1417">30.5%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1315 1419 1417">64.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.3%	3.3%	1.9%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.3%	7.2%	4.6%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12.9%	25.2%	9.2%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26%	33.8%	19.8%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	55.5%	30.5%	64.5%	<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 definition of "comparable to same aged peers." The State provided the required definition in its SPP.</p> <p>The State also reported the required progress data and improvement activities in its SPP. 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.	1.3%	3.3%	1.9%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.3%	7.2%	4.6%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12.9%	25.2%	9.2%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26%	33.8%	19.8%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	55.5%	30.5%	64.5%																							

Alabama's 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 an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 86.80%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 88.3%.</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 revised sampling plan.</p> <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>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 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 baseline and targets to reflect the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 2%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual numbers of districts determined in FFY 2005 and 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>The State reported that two of two 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</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 to: (1) refer to disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and not to significant disproportionality, in reporting on this indicator; and (2) review data and information for all racial and ethnic groups present in the State, including a review of data at the LEA level, in determining if there was disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>	<p>inappropriate identification, for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State referred to the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and not to significant disproportionality, in reporting on this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. The State also clarified that it examined data and information for all racial and ethnic groups present in the State in determining if there was disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</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 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 baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.53%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 11%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual numbers of districts determined in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that 14 of 14 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State, in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, to: (1) refer to the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and not to significant disproportionality, in reporting on this indicator; and (2) review data and information for all racial and ethnic groups present in the State, including a review of</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories 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>data at the LEA level, in determining if there was 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 referred to the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and not to significant disproportionality, in reporting on this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that it examined data and information for all racial and ethnic groups present in the State in determining if there was 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.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements of 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 specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification are in</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<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 language of its 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 84%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 82%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 48 LEAs that were not in compliance with this indicator in FFY 2005 "met the target for FFY 2006." For the uncorrected noncompliance in the remaining LEAs, the State reported that it had improved its data collection to include all LEAs in the State throughout the year, and that the State will be able to provide immediate technical assistance when the data indicate noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the reasons for delays (which the State refers to as reasons for school district error). The State provided the reasons for delays in meeting the timely evaluations requirements in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 timely evaluations 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 implemented by their third</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.07%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 76.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 32 of 37 LEAs that were not in compliance in FFY 2005 related to this indicator are no longer identified as noncompliant. For</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 demonstrating correction of the noncompliance with the early childhood</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it will continue to mandate rigorous improvement activities for those LEAs, analyze data on preschool transition at the LEA level, and provide technical assistance to LEAs when the data indicate noncompliance.</p>	<p>transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) identified in the FFY 2004 SPP and in the FFY 2005 APR. The State reported that rigorous improvement activities were mandated to correct prior noncompliance identified in the FFY 2004 SPP and the FFY 2005 APR, once it determined that the target was not met. The State reported that the 2005-06 reporting period was the first year that individual LEA data could be analyzed, because prior reporting procedures only generated State totals. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.44%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 91.62%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>Under Indicator 15, the State reported that four of four findings identified in</p>	<p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</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 secondary transition 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. [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. The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 79.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide the definitions for competitive employment and postsecondary school with its February 1, 2008 FFY 2006 APR submission. The State provided the required definitions. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that 123 of 124 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the remaining finding was corrected within two months of the one-year timeline.</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 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 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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'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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four hearings. 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 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 17.74%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 47.5%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 78.72%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 65%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>