

Utah 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 72.27% for students with IEPs, using the cohort rate. Based on the cohort rate, the State reported that the gap for students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma and all students graduating with a regular diploma as 11.68%. The State's FFY 2004 baseline data was calculated using an event rate of 70.01% for students with IEP's graduating from high school with a regular diploma. Using the event rate, the State reported the gap between students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma and all students graduating with a regular diploma in FFY 2004 as 15.57%.</p> <p>Because the State changed its method of calculation from an event rate to a cohort rate, OSEP cannot determine whether the State made progress from its FFY 2004 baseline or met its FFY 2005 target.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 are 4.9%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 baseline data of 3.56%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.56%.</p>	<p>The State revised its targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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>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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 73%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 48%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2005 reported data are 98% for Math and 99.6% for Language Arts. The State met its FFY 2005 targets of 95% for both Language Arts and Math.</p>	<p>The State met its targets and 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 2005 reported data are 43.89% for Math and 42.47% for Language Arts. This represents progress from FFY 2004 reported data of 36.64% for Math and 37.60% for Language Arts. The State met its target of 42% for Math. The State did not meet its target of 43% for Language Arts.</p>	<p>The State acknowledged difficulties in validating student level data and included activities to address the data anomalies in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 4.3%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 6.3%.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2005 APR, the State identified significant discrepancies in three school districts in rates of long-term suspension and expulsion but did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) their 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). In its FFY 2006</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		<p>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 LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR and (2) and the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. (The review for LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 APR may occur either during or after the FFY 2006 reporting period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR.)</p> <p>The State revised its improvement activities in the APR and OSEP accepts these revisions.</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>[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 interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21%</p>	<p>5A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 48.68%. The State met its target of 45.10%. 5B. The State's FFY 2005 reported</p>	<p>The State met its targets for indicators 5A and 5B. The State added improvement activities to address the slippage for Indicator 5C in the APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance for</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>data for this indicator are 14.72 %.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 18.50%.</p> <p>5C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data are 3.56%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 baseline data of 3.47%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 3.37%.</p>	<p>Indicator 5A and 5B and looks forward to data for Indicator 5C demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 59.4%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 56%.</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2005 target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected. If the State decided not to sample but rather to use census data, it was required to inform OSEP and revise its SPP accordingly. The State reported in the FFY 2005 APR that it will not use sampling and will collect data from all students.</p> <p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<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>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 91%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify whether the State intended to collect information through sampling, and if the State intended to use sampling to submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator; New]		<p>FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007.</p> <p>The State submitted a revised sampling plan that is not technically sound. Call your State Contact as soon as possible.</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's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported that 36 of 72 LEAs had one or more risk ratios that were above the plus or minus 0.5 risk ratio. The State explained in its discussion of baseline data that after a review of policies and procedures manuals and monitoring data, including student files and evaluation and identification procedures and interviews, that none of the LEAs reviewed that were above or below the plus or minus 0.5 risk ratio had any significant disproportionality based on inappropriate identification. The State also reported that it had made a change in the standard for determining significance of disproportionality Statewide to plus or minus 0.5, instead of plus or minus 0.3, above the perfect risk ratio of 1.0, originally reported in the SPP. The State explained that it had concluded that this change was needed due to the small number of LEAs in the State to enable the State to target more LEAs for evaluation of their identification processes.</p> <p>Although the State determined that in no districts the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, the State did not specify that it examined data for all racial and ethnic groups in the State in making this determination. The State must provide data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate that it examined data for all race and ethnicity categories in the State in identifying districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p>	<p>compliance with 34 CFR §300.173.</p> <p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported that 27 of 72 LEAs had one or more risk ratios that were above plus or minus 0.5 and targeted those LEAs for further evaluation of their identification practices. The State also conducted a careful review of the remainder of the disability categories. It described its process for review of identification practices in all LEAs through examination of policies and procedures manuals, monitoring data, student files, including evaluations and identification procedures and interviews. Based on this review, the State found 0.00% inappropriate identification in specific disability categories.</p> <p>Although the State identified districts with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories and determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification, the State did not specify that it examined data for all race and ethnicity categories in the State in making this determination. The State must provide data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate that it examined data for all race and ethnicity categories in the State in identifying districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with 34 CFR §300.173.</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</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; New]</p>	<p>The State FFY 2005 reported baseline data are 76%.</p> <p>The State did not provide data for all required measurements for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. Although the State indicated that it had adopted the IDEA-established 60-day timeline, the State indicated that it uses monitoring data to determine if the initial eligibility determination was made within 60 days of parental consent. Under 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1)(i), the initial evaluation must</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Valid and reliable baseline data not provided.	<p>be conducted within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation. The State should clarify in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, whether it is reporting data based on the IDEA 60-day timeline from parent consent to conduct of the evaluation or a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>The State reported that in 76% of the 42 reviewed files, evaluation occurred and eligibility was determined within 60 days of receipt of parental consent. However, while the State reported that 34 students were found eligible for services under IDEA, and that there were 10 findings of noncompliance on the initial evaluation 60-day timeline, the State did not provide data for all required measurements for this indicator. Specifically, the State did not report the number of children determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline (measurement (c)) or the number of children not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (measurement (b)). Without this information, OSEP cannot determine how the State calculated its baseline for this indicator. In addition, while the State provided the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined, the State did not include the reasons for the delays, as required by OSEP's instructions for this indicator. The State must provide data using the correct measurement, and the required explanation 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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 75%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 baseline data of 64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. The State did not report on correction of the prior</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR all required data and calculations in reporting its performance for this indicator. The State reported that it developed and implemented a method to track students referred from Part C to Part B, resulting in more accurate and complete transitioning information and that all required measurements were included in the FFY 2005 APR. However, the State accounted for 141 children included in measurement (a), in</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>noncompliance.</p> <p>Valid and reliable data not provided.</p>	<p>measurements (b), (c), and (d) and acknowledged that it was unable to account for 19 children not included in these measurements. The State did not account for the remaining 16 children included in measurement (a). The State must review and revise its improvement strategies, if necessary, to ensure that they will enable it to provide data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that more accurately track all children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2005 SPP response letter required the State to include data in the FFY 2005 APR that demonstrate full compliance with 34 CFR §300.124(b), which referenced correction of continuing noncompliance with early childhood transition requirements identified in the FFY 2002 and 2003 APR's. The State's FFY 2005 reported data indicate progress from the State's baseline of 64% to 75%. Although the State also identified noncompliance in 5 of 7 LEAs, it did not provide current documentation of correction. The State also included additional activities to address correction of noncompliance and OSEP accepts these revisions. The State must review its improvement activities 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 34 CFR §300.124, including data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, and noncompliance identified with early childhood transition requirements in the FFY 2002 and 2003 APRs.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State FFY 2005 reported baseline data are 78%. This calculation is based on the number of LEAs monitored (29 of 37) that served transition age youth that met compliance requirements.</p> <p>Valid and reliable baseline data not provided.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported that baseline data indicate that 78% of LEAs (29 of 37 LEAs) monitored that served transition aged students met compliance requirements for transition IEPs based on the file review instrument in place at the time which was developed in response to IDEA 2004 requirements which took effect on July 1, 2005. However, the State did not provide the percent of youth whose IEPs included the required content, as required by the measurement for this indicator, even for the LEAs monitored, including the number of IEPs for 16 year old</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>and older students and the percentage of compliant IEPs included in that number that met requirements for this indicator. The data reported is not sufficient for this indicator. The State also reported that its file review instrument subsequently has been modified for the 06-07 school year to reflect the final IDEA Part B regulations as well as more recent technical assistance guidance relating to Indicator 13. The State also reported that it modified its data collection system to more accurately report the data required for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data on the correct measurement for this indicator 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 the remaining noncompliance 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>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit a revised sampling methodology, with its FFY 2005 APR, that describes how data were collected or to inform OSEP if the State decides to collect data through a census and to revise the SPP accordingly.</p> <p>The State reported that a census survey would be used for all but the four largest LEAs, and the State submitted a sampling plan for those LEAs.</p> <p>The sampling plan for this indicator is not technically sound. Call your State Contact as soon as possible.</p> <p>The State provided a plan that describes how 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>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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 86.8%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 79.7%. The State recalculated its FFY 2004 data to provide for a single percentage for the indicator. The State did not meet</p>	<p>The State recalculated its baseline for this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR but did not revise its FFY 2004 baseline in its SPP. In the SPP, the State reported its FFY 2004 baseline as 61%, but in the FFY 2005 APR, the State reported its FFY 2004 baseline as 79.7% based on the average of State complaints, systemic, and non-systemic noncompliance. The State must revise its SPP to reflect this revised baseline.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>It also appears to OSEP that the State did not use the correct measurement in reporting its FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State indicated that current data for FFY 2005 indicate a 7.1% increase to 86.8% based on the average of priority areas. However, the State did not specify that it included in its calculation identified noncompliance that was timely corrected in State complaints, and that it would include timely correction of noncompliance identified in due process hearings if applicable. The State must ensure that it accounts for correction of noncompliance resulting from State complaints and due process hearings if applicable in reporting its FFY 2006 data for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that noncompliance with this indicator identified in the SPP was corrected. In the FFY 2005 APR, the State reported the number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2004, the status of timely correction of those findings in FFY 2005, and also specified the number of outstanding findings that are still being tracked for timely correction. The State also identified findings by topical areas, including FAPE, General Supervision, Parent Involvement, Transitions and Utah Requirements. Additionally, the State described its efforts to obtain correction of noncompliance after the one-year timeline has elapsed. The State added two new improvement activities aimed at correcting outstanding noncompliance and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must report in the FFY 2006 APR on its continued efforts to bring its LEAs into compliance, including any continuing enforcement actions.</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 of 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, including data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. 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. In addition, the State must, in responding to</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		Indicators 11, 12 and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators, including the correction of previous noncompliance with early childhood transition requirements identified in the FFY 2002 and 2003 APRs.
<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 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to demonstrate full compliance with this requirement in the FFY 2005 APR. 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 §300.152.</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 could not report data for this indicator since none of the due process hearing requests received during the FFY 2005 APR reporting period were fully adjudicated.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with 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; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide or meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions are conducted.</p>	<p>Although the State is not required to provide baseline, targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions were held, the State's revised SPP included this information, based on four resolution sessions held (See Table 7). Throughout the SPP discussion for this indicator, USOE referred to resolution sessions as "mandatory." Under the reauthorized IDEA, generally, a 30-day resolution process must take place before a due process hearing can occur, unless the parties agree in writing to waive the resolution session or decide to use the mediation process (34 CFR §300.510(a)(3)). In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, USOE must revise the language in the explanation of its resolution process to be consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.510.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	for this indicator are 87.5% (based on eight mediation sessions that were conducted). The State met its FFY 2005 target of 80%.	SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State is not required to provide or meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State's baseline data are 100%. Data not valid and reliable.	As noted in this table, issues regarding the validity and reliability of the State's data have been identified for FFY 2005 for Indicators 11, 12 and 13. Although the State's APR submission was timely, the State must consider the accuracy of its APR data when reporting data for this indicator. 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).