

Maine Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<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’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 66.1%.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data. The State provided incomplete data. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or met its FFY 2005 target of 76%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include accurate data in the February 1, 2007 APR for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2005 data based on data from only 117 of its 151 districts. Therefore, the data are not valid and reliable, and OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made.</p> <p>The State must provide complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. Data for this indicator must include all districts in the measurement.</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’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 8.6%.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data. The State provided incomplete data. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or met its FFY 2005 target of 4.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include accurate data for this indicator in the February 1, 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2005 data based on data from only 118 of its 153 districts. Therefore, the data are not valid and reliable, and OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made.</p> <p>The State must provide complete FFY 2005 progress data and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. Data for this indicator must include all districts in the measurement.</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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>For Reading, the State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 96.2%.</p> <p>For Math, the State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 98.2%.</p> <p>Valid and reliable data were not provided. The State did</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data, and OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress. The measurement for this indicator requires the State to report the percentage of <u>districts</u> that met the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup. Although the State reported in its FFY 2004 SPP on the percentage of districts, in the FFY 2005 APR the State reported the percentage of <u>schools</u>. Further, the State’s FFY 2005 data for this indicator did not include data for 11th grade students.</p> <p>The State must provide the required progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	not submit FFY 2005 data consistent with the required measurement for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or met its FFY 2005 target of 97% for Reading and 98.8% for Math.	2006 that includes results for all students in the grades assessed, and report by district the percent meeting AYP for the disability subgroup in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 99% for Reading (4th and 8th grade) and 98% for Math (4th and 8th grade). The State met its FFY 2005 target of 98% for Reading and Math for 4th and 8th grades.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Reading and Math for 11th grade are 87.9%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 99% for Reading for 11th grade and 98% for Math for 11th grade. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 90% for Reading and Math for 11th grade.</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2005 target for Reading and Math for 4th and 8th grades. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in Reading and Math for 11th grade in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 2005 reported proficiency data for Reading are 32% (4th grade), 16% (8th grade), and 11% (11th grade). This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 20% (4th grade), 9% (8th</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>grade), and 7% (11th grade). The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 41% (4th grade), 42% (8th grade), and 50% (11th grade).</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported proficiency data for Math are 34% (4th grade), 12% (8th grade), and 10% (11th grade). This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 18% (4th grade), 6% (8th grade), and 2% (11th grade). The State met its FFY 2005 target of 21% (4th grade). The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 22% (8th grade), and 22% (11th grade).</p>	
<p>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]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are .65% (one LEA). The State met its FFY 2005 target of identifying three (or fewer) LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.</p>	<p>The State revised its methodology for identifying districts with significant discrepancies, and revised its baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Using the new methodology, the State recalculated baseline data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) in its SPP and identified one district in FFY 2004 with a significant discrepancy. The State reported those same data in the FFY 2005 APR for its FFY 2005 progress data. The State did not specify whether the data submitted in the FFY 2005 APR are the recalculated FFY 2004 baseline data or FFY 2005 progress data. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify its FFY 2004 baseline data and its FFY 2005 progress data, as well as provide its FFY 2006 progress data.</p> <p>The State was instructed in Table B of OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter to describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) its 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the 25 LEAs that met the State’s criteria for significant discrepancies in FFY 2004. The State did not provide this information. In addition, the State identified a significant discrepancy in one district (based on the new methodology) in the FFY 2005 APR but did not describe how it reviewed and, if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b). In its FFY 2006 APR, 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: (1) the 25 LEAs that met the State’s criteria for significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004; (2) the one LEA identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (3) for any LEA identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year’s submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 57.1%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 55.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 60%.</p> <p>B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 11.2%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 12%.</p> <p>C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 3.5%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance for Indicator 5A in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State met its targets for Indicators 5B and 5C, and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 79%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 79.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 81%.</p>	<p>The State reported slippage in its FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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>Entry data provided, but they are not valid and reliable because they are not based on the required measurement.</p>	<p>The State's entry data are not valid and reliable. The required measurement for this indicator is the percent of preschool children, aged three through five, who demonstrate improved performance in the specified areas. The State reported entry data for children aged birth through five.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The progress data must be for children aged three through five, as required by the measurement for this indicator.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator; New]		
<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; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 85% for school-aged and 94% for preschool. OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 86.1%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP has recalculated the State's FFY 2005 progress data. The State reported FFY 2005 data showing that: (1) 85% of 6945 parents of school-aged children with disabilities responding to the parent survey (which OSEP calculated to be approximately 6857 parents) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities; and (2) 94% of 1015 parents of preschool-aged children with disabilities responding to the parent survey (which OSEP calculated to be approximately 954 parents) reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This calculates to overall FFY 2005 baseline data of 86.1% (6857/7960). In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, we recommend that the State either combine the data into one percentage or establish two sets of targets, one for school-aged and one for preschool.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State that if it intended to collect information through sampling, it must include a revised sampling plan in the February 1, 2007 APR. The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The sampling plan for this indicator is not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible.</p> <p>The State did not submit a copy of the survey with its February 2007 revised SPP, as required by the SPP instructions. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
<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; New]</p>	<p>The State identified one district with disproportionate representation in special education and related services.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported in the revised SPP that, in determining disproportionate representation in special education and related services, the analysis of means calculation was applied to districts with greater than 10 students in all five ethnic groups. The State reported that only two LEAs in the State met the minimum population requirement. A State may, in reviewing data for each race ethnicity category, do so in a statistically appropriate manner,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and may set an “n” size that applies to all racial and ethnic groups. However, requiring a district to meet the “n” size in all five ethnic groups skews the data and results in the State examining data for disproportionality in special education and related services in only two LEAs. It could exclude districts that have a large number of students in one ethnic group, but fewer than 10 students in any of the other groups. OSEP strongly encourages the State to address this issue in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State identified one district with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). The State indicated that it would not make a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation in that district was the result of inappropriate identification until it conducts its review of the district’s policies, procedures and practices as part of its monitoring visit to the district in 2009-2010. The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State may not wait until its monitoring review of the district scheduled for 2009-2010. The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</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; New]</p>	<p>The State identified one district with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified one district with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). The State indicated that it would not make a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation in that district was the result of inappropriate identification until it conducts its review of the district’s policies, procedures and practices as part of its monitoring visit to the district in 2009-2010. The</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State may not wait until its monitoring review of the districts scheduled for 2009-2010. The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>In addition, the State must revise the target language in the SPP (for every year) to more closely align with the measurement for this indicator.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 85%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>Although required by the SPP/APR instructions, the State did not provide the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within the State timeline. The State also did not account for children whose evaluations were not completed within the State timeline by indicating the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed, and any reasons for the delays. The State must provide the required data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 birthdays.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 97%.</p> <p>The data are not valid and reliable. The State did not</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator, because it provided data from December 2, 2004 through December 1, 2005. The required reporting period for the FFY 2005 APR was July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	provide data for the required reporting period. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress or met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide valid and reliable progress data for the required reporting periods for FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) and FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007) for this indicator.
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 83%.	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of compliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	A plan that describes how data will be collected for submission with the APR due February 1, 2008 was provided.	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how the data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State, that if it intended to collect information through sampling, it must include a revised sampling plan in the February 1, 2007 APR. The State submitted a revised sampling plan. The sampling plan for this indicator is not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible.</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>	In its FFY 2005 APR, the State reported 100% compliance for this indicator. However, those data are based upon correction of findings of noncompliance that the State made in 2005-2006, rather than correction in 2005-2006 of findings that the State made in 2004-2005, as required by the measurement for this indicator. Therefore, the State's data are not valid and reliable. OSEP cannot	<p>The State did not, as required by the instructions, recalculate the baseline for this indicator to provide a single baseline for this indicator, rather than separate baselines for the former indicators 15A, 15B, and 15C.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator; (2) documentation that it was effectively identifying and correcting noncompliance related to services for school-aged and preschool-aged children with disabilities that are publicly placed in private, special-purpose schools; (3) data specific to the correction of noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool-aged children, as set forth in their IEPs/IFSPs; and (4) documentation that it has ensured the correction of the noncompliance related to the secondary transition requirements.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	determine whether the State met its FFY 2005 target.	<p>As noted above, the State did not, as required by the measurement for this indicator, report on the percent of findings made in 2004-2005 that were timely corrected in 2005-2006.</p> <p>The State did not provide: (1) any documentation that it is effectively identifying and correcting noncompliance related to services for school-aged and preschool-aged children with disabilities that are publicly placed in private, special-purpose schools; (2) data specific to the correction of noncompliance regarding the provision of services to preschool-aged children, as set forth in their IEPs/IFSPs; or (3) documentation that it has ensured the correction of the noncompliance related to the secondary transition requirements. The State must provide that documentation in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005 (2005-2006). In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 81.3%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.661(a) and (b) (now 34 CFR §300.152(a) and (b)).</p> <p>The data that the State reported for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR and in Table 7 were inconsistent with each other and unclear. In the Explanation of Progress or Slippage, the State reported that 49 complaints were "processed" during the reporting period, with 19 resulting in reports being issued. In Table 7, the State did not report the total number of written, signed complaints, and reported that there were 49 complaints with reports issued, 19 reports with findings, 13 complaints withdrawn or dismissed, and 30 complaints pending. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide data that are consistent with the data in Table 7.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.
<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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.511 (now 34 CFR §300.515 (a)).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p> <p>The State's SPP includes improvement activities only for FFY 2005, and does not include activities to maintain compliance under this indicator for FFY 2006-2010. The State must include maintenance and/or improvement activities for FFY 2006 through FFY 2010 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 baseline data are 57%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities under this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 76%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>Although the State reported 100% compliance for this indicator, the State did not report valid and reliable data for Indicators 1, 2, 3A, 7, 12, and 15.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>