

Georgia – Part B

Chart A

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p><b>All Indicators with Targets:</b> In those Indicators where the State established targets, only percentages were listed.</p>	<p>The State only listed percentages as targets for those Indicators where targets were required. OSEP cannot determine whether these percentages are based upon the measures established by OSEP for each such Indicator. Therefore, the State must clarify that the targets are for the measures established by OSEP for each such Indicator.</p>	<p>By no later than its submission of the FFY 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR), due February 1, 2007, the State must clarify that each percentage target is based upon the measurement established by OSEP for each Indicator.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 12:</b> 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State did not, as required by the SPP instructions for Indicator 12, include data in the SPP regarding: (1) the number of children referred from Part C to Part B determined, prior to their third birthdays, to be NOT eligible; or (2) for children whose eligibility was determined after their third birthdays, the range of days beyond their third birthdays when their eligibility was determined. In its discussion of Indicator 12, the State explained that the timeline logs from local systems do not currently enable the State to collect those data. The State further reported that procedures have been revised to include all data elements for Indicator 12 and that the data will be available for the 2005-2006 school year.</p>	<p>The State must report all required data for Indicator 12, including: (1) the number of children referred from Part C to Part B determined, prior to their third birthdays, to be NOT eligible; and (2) for children whose eligibility was determined after their third birthdays, the range of days beyond their third birthdays when their eligibility was determined, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include these data may impact OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

<b>SPP Indicator</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Required Action</b>
<p><b>Indicator 15:</b> 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>1. The State reported, in its November 29, 2005 letter submitted with the SPP, that when it conducts on-site record reviews, it “ensures compliance within one year of corrective action.” OSEP is concerned that this appears to be inconsistent with requiring correction within one year of identification.</p> <p>2. The State did not include baseline data for Indicators 15A and 15B, explaining that the State conducted only post-monitoring during the 2003-2004 school year (the State was transitioning to a new accountability system during that school year), and that data were not available regarding timely correction for 2004-2005. However, the State does appear to have data on the timely correction of noncompliance that was identified through monitoring conducted during the 2002-2003 school year.</p>	<p>1. The State must ensure that it measures, and requires, timely correction from identification of the noncompliance.</p> <p>2. For Indicators 15A and 15B, in the APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must include baseline data, based upon the timely (within one year of identification) correction of all noncompliance that was identified during 2002-2003. In addition, the State must include annual performance data for Indicators 15A and 15B based upon the timely correction, during the 2005-2006 school year, of noncompliance identified during 2004-2005. Failure to include these data may affect OSEP’s determination in 2007 of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).</p>
<p><b>Indicator 18:</b> Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>OSEP is unable to determine whether the plan included for new Indicator 18 will result in the collection of the required data by the submission of the APR, due February 1, 2007.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that any activities or strategies for Indicator 18 result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the indicated time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. Failure to report the required data in the APR may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>