

Table B – Oklahoma Part B

Previously-Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><u>SPP Indicators 3 and 15:</u> In its August 29, 2005 FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report (APR) response letter, OSEP required the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) to submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within 60 days, data, analysis, and a determination of compliance or noncompliance of its LEAs with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16) addressing participation in assessments. ▪ In the SPP, data and analysis demonstrating progress toward compliance and documentation that OSDE's procedures are effective in ensuring compliance with 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16). 	<p>OSDE submitted, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On page 39, data indicating that noncompliance related to assessment was found in 26 LEAs in 2003-2004 and that the noncompliance was corrected in 100% of those LEAs within one year of identification. ▪ On page 9, data demonstrating that, in FFY 2004, 100% of students with disabilities participated in regular math and reading assessments and that 62.45% of children with IEPs participated, with accommodations, in math and reading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State reported data showing full correction of the previously-identified noncompliance with the requirement at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16). OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in ensuring compliance with this requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continued compliance with this requirement.
<p><u>SPP Indicator 4:</u> In its August 2005 letter, OSEP required OSDE to submit, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data and analysis regarding the percentage of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the suspension and expulsion rates of children with disabilities. ▪ Whether OSDE compared the suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities across LEAs or compared the rates for children with and without disabilities within each LEA as required by 34 CFR §300.146(b). 	<p>OSDE submitted, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On page 13, documentation that it identified significant discrepancies in 15.19% of its LEAs. ▪ On pages 12-13, documentation and data demonstrating that OSDE is able to collect and compare the suspension and expulsion rates for children with and without disabilities within LEAs as required by 34 CFR §300.146(b). ▪ On page 14, as an improvement strategy, a plan to review policies, procedures and practices to determine if changes need to be made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The data and information submitted was responsive and met the requirements of OSEP's August 2005 letter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No further action required.

Table B – Oklahoma Part B

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><u>SPP Indicators 9&10:</u> In its August 2005 letter, OSEP required OSDE to submit, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data, analysis and targets documenting that OSDE is able to identify and address significant disproportionality in identification as required by 34 CFR §300.755. 	<p>OSDE submitted, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On pages 25-28, documentation that it will use the risk ratio method to compute significant discrepancies in disproportionality as a result of inappropriate identification. ▪ Documentation that LEAs found to have significant discrepancies will be flagged for a review of policies and practices to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The information submitted was responsive and met the requirements of OSEP's August 2005 letter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No further action required.
<p><u>SPP Indicator 11:</u> In its August 2005 letter, OSEP noted that the FFY 2003 APR indicated noncompliance with requirements for evaluation/reevaluation for 65.8% of the 79 districts monitored. OSEP asked the State to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make a determination whether data collected related to this area would be responsive to the requirements for SPP indicator 11. 	<p>OSDE submitted, in the SPP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On page 29, documentation that it would obtain, from each LEA, a variety of student-level data through its OSDE Special Education Child Count System, to include information regarding the timeliness of evaluations and eligibility determinations. This system will allow OSDE staff to analyze data to determine timeliness of evaluations and eligibility determinations by district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The information submitted was responsive and met the requirements of OSEP's August 2005 letter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No further action required.