

Table A – Part B
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>The State used FFY 2003 data for baseline information in response to this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>The State used FFY 2003 data for baseline information in response to this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))</p>	<p>An evaluation of the sampling plan for Indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>As indicated in OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State indicated in the SPP Introduction (page 2), that sampling would be used to collect baseline information in response to this indicator. However, on page 69 in the section of the SPP addressing this indicator, the State reported it would use data from the State's monitoring system to report on this indicator. Thus, OSEP reads this section of the SPP to mean that the State will report all data, rather than a sample of the data, gathered from the annual cohort of LEAs through the State's monitoring system.</p> <p>A second issue is that the State used FFY 2003 data for baseline information in response to this indicator.</p>	<p>Sampling is not permitted when collecting data for this indicator. Data is to be taken from the State monitoring or State data system. If the State uses its monitoring system, it must describe how it selects LEAs for monitoring. The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicators 11 and 13:</p> <p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</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>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>The State indicated in the SPP Introduction (page 2), that sampling would be used to collect baseline information in response to these indicators. However, on pages 65 and 78 in the sections of the SPP addressing these indicators, the State reported it would use data from the State's monitoring system to report on these indicators. Thus, OSEP reads these sections of the SPP to mean that the State will report all data gathered from the annual cohort of LEAs in the State's monitoring schedule for each year.</p>	<p>Sampling is not permitted when collecting data for these indicators. Data is to be taken from the State monitoring or State data system. If the State uses its monitoring system, it must describe how it selects LEAs for monitoring. The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007 data from FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>