

Pennsylvania 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.</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 revised its method for collecting and calculating the data for this indicator. The State recalculated its FFY 2004 baseline data to be 88.27% and FFY 2005 progress data to be 89.31%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84.48%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 89.31%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 92.65%.</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, actual numbers when reporting data for this indicator. The State reported actual numbers as required.</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>OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP as posted on its website is revised to reflect the revised baseline data.</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.</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 revised its method for collecting and calculating the data for this indicator. The State recalculated its FFY 2004 baseline data to be 10.22% and FFY 2005 progress data to be 9.52%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 14.17%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 9.52%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 6.65%.</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, actual numbers when reporting data for this indicator. The State reported actual numbers as required.</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>OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP as posted on its website is revised to reflect the revised baseline data.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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.</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 for grade span 3 through 5 are 71.0% (291 districts). These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 62.3%. The State met its FFY 2006 target that 112 districts in the grade span would achieve AYP.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator for grade span 6 through 8 are 68.4% (294 districts). These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 52.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target that 52 districts</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Pennsylvania 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]	<p>in the grade span would achieve AYP.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator for grade span 9 through 12 are 39.1% (52 districts). These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 28.7%. The State met its FFY 2006 target that 33 districts in the grade span would achieve AYP.</p>	
<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 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 97.6% for math and 97.3% for reading. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.4% for math and 97.2% for reading.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95.25%.</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 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 28.5% for reading and 33.6% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 28.3% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 32.4% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 28.8% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 29.2% for math.</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>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</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 5.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 5.2%.</p> <p>The State further reported that 2.2% of districts suspended students with disabilities for more than ten days at a rate greater than four times the State baseline rate. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target that no more than</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 how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected districts to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>1% of school districts would suspend students with disabilities for more than ten days at a rate greater than four times the State baseline rate.</p>	<p>behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR. The State provided the required description in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</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>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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

Pennsylvania 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]																		
<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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 347 1419 729"> <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 align="center">46.5%</td> <td align="center">49.7%</td> <td align="center">43.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">14.4%</td> <td align="center">12.4%</td> <td align="center">16.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">4.4%</td> <td align="center">4.2%</td> <td align="center">4.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for Indicator 5A and 5B and did not meet its FFY 2006 target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	46.5%	49.7%	43.8%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.4%	12.4%	16.0%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	<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 than 21% of the day.	46.5%	49.7%	43.8%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.4%	12.4%	16.0%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%															
<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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1295 1419 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th>Social Emotional</th> <th>Knowledge & Skills</th> <th>Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. % of preschoolers who did not</td> <td align="center">0%</td> <td align="center">0%</td> <td align="center">2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not	0%	0%	2%	<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, progress data and improvement activities. The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009,</p>								
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior															
a. % of preschoolers who did not	0%	0%	2%															

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	improve functioning.				<p>and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16%	30%	16%	
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	35%	28%	17%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26%	19%	37%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23%	23%	28%	
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</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 35.12%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 35.08%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 35.76%.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</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 that no districts were identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</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, an explanation of whether the FFY 2005 State reported data of 0% were based on the State's determination: (1) there was no disproportionate representation; or (2) there was no disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification, and if so, how the State determined whether disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. In the FFY</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2006 APR, the State clarified there were no districts identified with disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in FFY 2005 and therefore, no further analysis for inappropriate identification was required.</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'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 that no districts were identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</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, an explanation of whether the FFY 2005 State reported data of 0% were based on the State's determination: (1) there was no disproportionate representation; or (2) there was no disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification, and if so, how the State determined whether disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State clarified there were no districts identified with disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in FFY 2005 and therefore, no further analysis for inappropriate identification was required.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 94.35%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 81 of 81 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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>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 95.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data OSEP calculated to be 86.45%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 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, data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 has been corrected.</p> <p>The State further reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements was 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 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>The State revised the FFY 2005 baseline data and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 baseline data of 72%.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 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</p>

Pennsylvania 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]		<p>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>OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP as posted on its website is revised to reflect the revised FFY 2005 baseline data.</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 66%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that "first-level sanctions" were initiated with one school district that did not demonstrate required progress toward correcting noncompliance, and that correction was achieved within a five month extension of the one year timeline.</p>	<p>The State revised the description of its system of general supervision for this indicator in the SPP and OSEP accepts this revision.</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.</p> <p>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 indicators.</p>

Pennsylvania 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.</p> <p>[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%.</p> <p>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.</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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 96.5%.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 33%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 67.7%.</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, documentation that the State revised its SPP targets to accurately reflect resolution sessions, rather than mediation. The State's FFY 2006 APR and revised SPP accurately reflect the requirements for this indicator.</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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 80.8%.</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>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and</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 94.5%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	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).