

Table A – Montana Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> 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>Other: Montana's Office of Public Instruction (OPI) did not provide the information required under this indicator. On page 10, OPI indicated that graduation data for general education students was not available for 2004-2005. Therefore, in order to make comparisons, 2003-2004 data were utilized. OPI indicated that it was developing an updated information management system that they predict will be operational during the 2008-2009 school year.</p>	<p>OPI 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 both types of data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> 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>Other: OPI did not provide the information required under this indicator. On page 15, OPI indicated that dropout data for general education students were not available for 2004-2005. Therefore, in order to make comparisons, 2003-2004 data were utilized. OPI is developing an updated information management system that they predict will be operational during the 2008-2009 school year.</p>	<p>OPI 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 both types of these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 8:</b> 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>Other: OSEP could not determine if OPI planned to use sampling in collecting data for this Indicator. If so, it is important that OPI have a technically sound sampling plan to ensure that data used for entry, baseline, or to report on progress are valid and reliable. 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 OPI's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>	<p>If OPI intends to collect information through sampling, the SPP must include sampling methodology to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data on which to base targets and improvement activities. OPI must submit the revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with its APR, due February 1, 2007. If OPI decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, OPI must inform OSEP and revise its SPP accordingly.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<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>Other: OPI did not provide the information required under this indicator. OPI reported utilizing 2003-2004 data. In addition, OPI indicated that it collects data through collaboration with Part C and through its compliance monitoring activities but that it does not have a system in place to collect the specific data as required by this indicator. OPI indicated that a system to address all of the requirements of this indicator will be implemented in 2008-2009.</p>	<p>OPI 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 both types of these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<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>Noncompliance: The State reported a 94% level of compliance for correction of noncompliance within one year of identification for nonpriority areas with this indicator in the SPP. While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. OPI should report data in this area in the General Supervision indicator of the APR due February 1, 2007, under correction of noncompliance for nonpriority areas.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 20:</b> State-reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))</p>	<p>Other: While the SPP contains a discussion of OPI's efforts to ensure accuracy of data, OPI's targets do not address accuracy of data.</p>	<p>In the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2007, OPI must include revised targets that address accuracy of data.</p>