

District of Columbia 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 2,450 graduates and 205 students with disabilities who received a diploma.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State did not submit FFY 2005 data consistent with the required measurement for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its FFY 2005 target of increasing the graduation rate to 73% overall and increasing the graduation rate to 63% for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 30, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR both baseline data from FFY 2004 (2004-2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (2005-2006). While the State provided some data, the State did not provide its FFY 2004 baseline data for students with disabilities in a percentage format and did not provide progress data for students with disabilities for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State provided the number of graduates and the number of students with disabilities receiving a diploma for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. The State reported an overall graduation rate of 71% for FFY 2004. However, the State did not submit all relevant raw data and did not apply the correct measurement when reporting data for this indicator. Specifically, the State provided the <u>number</u> of youth rather than the <u>percent</u> of youth with IEPs that graduated with a regular diploma for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data and measurement in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State must report this information for FFY 2004 to establish its baseline data for this indicator and progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>OSEP suggests that the State review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide the required data 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 did not provide FFY 2005 data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its FFY 2005 target of reducing the dropout rate to 6.7% for all students.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. OSEP also advised the State that after establishing baseline data, the State might need to adjust its targets and improvement activities to reflect the baseline data.</p> <p>The State reported its FFY 2004 baseline data for this indicator as 7.6% for all youth in the State dropping out of high school and a dropout rate of 0.94% for students with disabilities. The State did not report its progress data for FFY 2005. The State reported that dropout data would be available in February 2007.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State must provide the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>Additionally, while the State's targets for this indicator address the overall percent of youth dropping out of high school, they do not reflect the requirements for this indicator. OSEP strongly recommends that the State revise its targets to ensure they specifically address the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school and provide documentation of its revised targets in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<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 did not provide FFY 2005 data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its revised FFY 2005 targets of 47.37% for Reading and 40.28% for Mathematics for elementary education and 43.58% for Reading and 40.55% for Mathematics for secondary education.</p>	<p>The State reports it implemented a new statewide assessment and revised its FFY 2005 targets for this indicator. OSEP accepts those revisions. The SPP does not include the revised targets for FFY 2005 or for future reporting periods. OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP as posted on its website is revised to reflect these changes.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR the number of LEAs that have a disability subgroup that meet the State's minimum "n" size, and the number of those LEAs that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress in the disability subgroup. The State did not include this information in its February 1, 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator and did not provide other information required by OSEP's March 30, 2006 correspondence. The State must provide progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 and other information required, consistent with the measurement and instructions for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State must ensure that the data reported are consistent with the requirements for this indicator (i.e., reflect the <i>percent of districts meeting the minimum "n" size</i> that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress in the disability subgroup).</p> <p>OSEP suggests that the State review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 88.7% for Mathematics</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>and 89.5% for Reading. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 88%.</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 for this indicator are 7.6% for Mathematics and 10.9% for Reading. Based on the section 618 data table, OSEP recalculated the FFY 2005 data to be 12.16% for Reading. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 15.77% for Mathematics and 15.99% for Reading. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 27%.</p>	<p>The State did not accurately calculate its FFY 2005 results for Reading for this indicator. OSEP recalculated the data based upon the State's 618 data (Table 6).</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report data for this indicator that are consistent with its 618 State reported data. 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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are a total of 543 suspension/expulsions for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State did not submit FFY 2005 data consistent with the required measurement for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its FFY 2005 target of</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. The State was informed that it must perform one of the required comparisons in 34 CFR §300.170 [formerly 34 CFR §300.146] and if significant discrepancies are occurring, must review and, if appropriate, revise (or require the affected public agency or LEA to revise) its policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. OSEP also advised the State that it should review, and if necessary, revise its improvement activities to ensure they will enable it to include data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State did not report its FFY 2004 baseline or FFY 2005 progress data or</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>reducing the number of districts with significant discrepancies by 2% from the baseline.</p>	<p>provide an explanation of the data in a manner consistent with the measurement. Although the State reported the <u>number of students</u> suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year, the State did not report the <u>percent of districts</u> identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year. Additionally, on page 16 of the SPP and on page 13 of the February 1, 2007 APR, the State indicates that data from the charter LEAs are not included in the State's 618 State reported data.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and did not provide the required information for this indicator consistent with the measurement. It is not clear to OSEP whether the State performed one of the required comparisons in 34 CFR §300.170 or whether the State determined a discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsions exists, and would, therefore, require a review of policies, procedures and practices, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170.</p> <p>In its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide the required data, measurement, and explanation of its data to establish baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data for FFY 2005 and 2006. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must also 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 any LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies. (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 the review in the FFY 2006 APR.)</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State is encouraged to access technical assistance available through the Mid-South Regional Resource Center and OSEP regarding the requirements for this indicator.</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</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,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>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% of the day; [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 21.1%. The State's 618 data for FFY 2005 are 22.91%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 10.5%.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report data for this indicator that are consistent with its 618 State reported data. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 18.6%. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2005 target of 15%. While the FFY 2005 data of 18.6% could appear as slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 15.4%, the State has improved its overall performance in the percent of children being educated in less restrictive environments.</p>	<p>The State revised its targets for this indicator in the SPP 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>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator</p>	<p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report data for this indicator that are consistent with its 618 State reported data.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>are 27.0%. The State's 618 data for FFY 2005 are 24.4%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 30%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 68%.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because they do not include data for children with IEPs who received special education and related services in community Head Start programs. As a result, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its FFY 2005 target of 77%.</p>	<p>The State revised the SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>On page 18 of the February 1, 2007 APR, the State indicates it did not include preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in community Head Start programs in its FFY 2005 data. As a result, the State did not submit all relevant data and data that are valid and reliable to fully address the requirements of this indicator. The State has developed a system for collecting child count data from these programs.</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 not provided.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter advised the State that it must ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the required baseline data, for the required time period, and that the entry data, progress baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. The State did not provide the entry data in its February 1, 2007 SPP for this indicator as required.</p> <p>The State has established targets for this indicator. It is not clear to OSEP how the State was able to identify targets and improvement activities, given that no baseline data currently exist. The State may wish to adjust its targets and improvement activities after baseline data have been established for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State has a plan to collect the data, however, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State's plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the State's ability to provide valid and reliable progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		due February 1, 2008. Please contact your State Contact for technical assistance.
<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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 68.2%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP commends the State's efforts in implementing the activities necessary to address this indicator and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2006 progress data.</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 identified one district with disproportionate representation of black students in special education and related services.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter advised the State it should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2005 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified one district with disproportionate representation of black students in special education and related services, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). It appears the LEA identified with disproportionate representation is DCPS, the LEA. OSEP cannot determine if the State examined data in its other LEAs to determine if disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification is occurring. In the February 1, 2007 APR, on pages 40 through 42, the State describes the steps it will take to ensure that any identified disproportionality within any District LEA will be examined to determine why disproportionate representation is occurring and specifically, whether it is the result of inappropriate identification. The State also describes the steps that will be taken to correct noncompliance that may be identified by the State related to disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the <u>percent of districts</u> identified with disproportionate representation of</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, procedures, and practices, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the <u>percent of districts</u> identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p>
<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 identified one district with disproportionate representation of black students in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that one district has disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3).</p> <p>The State indicated that it is only examining data on overidentification of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Indicator 10, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires States to identify disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of races and ethnicities in specific disability categories. The State must clarify, in its FFY 2006 APR, that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of races and ethnicities in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the <u>percent of districts</u> identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, procedures and practices, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the <u>percent of districts</u> identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</p>		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 did not provide FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2004 (2004-2005) data of 22.3%. The State reported data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>The State did not submit baseline data for FFY 2005 as required; however, the State did provide a plan for collection using its ENCORE data system. The State must provide both baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</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 37%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 17%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not address correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</p>	<p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) accurate data and calculations when reporting its performance on this indicator; and (2) data that demonstrate compliance with 34 CFR §300.132(b) (now 34 CFR §300.124(b)). The FFY 2005 data indicate continued noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124 (see Indicator 15).</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure 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.</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's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 39%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. This indicator requires statewide data and the State's baseline data include charter schools that are LEAs for the purposes of Part B of IDEA and the DCPS LEA as required.</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 the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected. The State did not provide its definition of competitive employment and post-secondary school, as required by the instructions for this indicator. The State must submit this information and baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter advised the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR its sampling methodology that describes how data are to be collected or if the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, to inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly. On page 61 of the February 1, 2007 SPP, the State indicates it will gather census data for this indicator, rather than sampling, and the State has revised the SPP to reflect this change.</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>In its FFY 2005 APR, the State reported 69% compliance for this indicator. However, because the State made no findings of noncompliance in FFY 2004 (2004-2005), those data are based upon correction of findings of noncompliance that the State made in 2005-2006, rather than correction in 2005-2006 of findings that the State made in 2004-2005, as required by the measurement for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if the State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State's February 1, 2007 <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions Progress Report</u> indicates that 78.5% of findings of</p>	<p>In its February 1, 2007 APR, on page 22, the State indicates that its FFY 2005 target is "100% identification of deficiencies as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification." However, the State's targets in the SPP accurately reflect the requirements for this indicator. OSEP considered the targets in the SPP when evaluating the State's compliance with the requirements for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006, SPP response letter states that, while the State monitored in FFY 2004, it did not make any findings of noncompliance until the High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports were issued on December 8, 2005. Because the State did not make any findings of noncompliance during FFY 2004 (2004-2005), in order to demonstrate compliance with this indicator in the February 1, 2007 APR, OSEP required the State to submit data on the <u>percent of findings</u> of noncompliance made in the December 8, 2005 High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports that was <u>corrected within one year of the State's identification of the noncompliance</u>. The State was informed it must include the required data and measurement in reporting its performance on this indicator in the February 1, 2007 APR.</p> <p><u>APR Data</u></p> <p>On page 23 of the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reports:</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>noncompliance made in the December 8, 2005 High School and Middle/Junior School monitoring reports was corrected within one year of the identified noncompliance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 of 16 findings made through monitoring (69%) were corrected within one year of the State’s identification of the noncompliance; and • 31 findings of noncompliance were made through investigation of State complaints but the State does not have a mechanism in place to determine if the noncompliance identified through these investigations was corrected timely. <p>The State does not clearly indicate in its FFY 2005 APR, the timeframe in which the noncompliance reported in the APR was identified, nor does it indicate that any findings of noncompliance were made through the due process hearings component of its general supervision system.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2006 grant award letter to the State, dated July 11, 2006, required the State to include as part of its response to this indicator in the FFY 2005 APR, the <u>number of findings</u> of noncompliance identified in the District’s December 8, 2005 monitoring reports, and the <u>number of corrections</u> the State has verified were completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. For any findings of noncompliance identified in the December 8, 2005 monitoring reports that were not corrected by December 8, 2006, the State was required to <u>provide a description of any actions the State has taken, including enforcement actions, to ensure correction</u> of the findings(s).</p> <p>OSEP also required the State, as part of its response to Indicator 15, to provide data that include the <u>number of findings</u> of noncompliance the State identified in its December 8, 2005 monitoring reports specifically related to implementation of the least restrictive environment (LRE) requirements and the <u>number and percentage of those findings that were corrected</u> within one year of identification. The State was also required to provide an explanation of the process, including standards, it used to calculate the levels of compliance reported in the June 27, 2006 Addendum to the State’s June 16, 2005 <u>FFY 2005 Special Conditions</u> Final Progress Report related to implementation of the least restrictive environment requirements in the High and Middle/Junior High School divisions.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions Progress Report Data:</u></p> <p><u>Identification and Correction of Noncompliance (In General)</u></p> <p>In its <u>Special Conditions</u> Progress Report dated February 1, 2007, the State</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>reports under its “General Supervision Response” that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 of 7 findings of noncompliance identified in the High School monitoring reports were corrected within one year for a timely correction rate of 85.7%; and • 5 of 7 findings of noncompliance identified in the Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports were corrected within one year for a timely correction rate of 71.4%. <p>Based upon these data, OSEP calculates that the State’s overall rate of correction of noncompliance identified in the High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports within one year of identification is 78.5%. The State did not describe any actions, including enforcement actions, it has taken to ensure correction of any remaining noncompliance identified in the High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 30, 2006 letter required that the State submit documentation that: (1) it ensured the correction of the noncompliance identified in the December 8, 2005 High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports related to the requirements in 34 CFR §300.106 (formerly 34 CFR §300.309) regarding extended school year services; and (2) it is monitoring to ensure compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.105 and 300.324(a)(2)(v) (formerly 34 CFR §§300.308 and 300.346(a)(2)(v)) regarding provision of assistive technology devices and services. While DCPS reported that 11 of 14 findings in the December 8, 2005 High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports, including findings regarding extended school year services, were corrected, DCPS did not provide information in its February 1, 2007 APR or <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report that specifically addresses if the noncompliance in the High School and Middle/Junior High School monitoring reports related to extended school year services was corrected. Additionally, the monitoring reports submitted with the <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report do not include documentation that demonstrates the State is monitoring to ensure compliance with the requirements related to the provision of assistive technology devices and services.</p> <p><u>Identification and Correction of Noncompliance Related to LRE Requirements</u></p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In its <u>Special Conditions</u> Progress Report dated February 1, 2007, the State reported inconsistent information regarding the number of findings made related to implementation of the LRE requirements. In its “LRE Response,” the State indicates 7 findings of noncompliance were made in the High School and Middle/Junior High School divisions. However, the State also reports that 8 of 9 findings related to the LRE provisions were corrected within one year of identification for a timely correction rate of 89%. While the State indicates that “technical assistance” was provided, it does not provide any further information regarding any actions, including enforcement actions, taken to ensure correction of remaining uncorrected noncompliance. The State did not provide an explanation of the process, including standards, it used to calculate the levels of compliance reported in the June 27, 2006 Addendum to the State’s June 16, 2005 <u>FFY 2005 Special Conditions</u> Final Progress Report related to implementation of the least restrictive environment requirements in the High and Middle/Junior High School divisions as required by OSEP’s July 11, 2006 correspondence.</p> <p>It appears, based upon the information provided in its “LRE Response,” the State does not have a clear understanding of the LRE provisions that must be monitored and the results documented, in order to satisfy its responsibilities under section 612(a)(5)(A) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §§300.114 through 300.120 and to meet the <u>Special Condition</u> imposed on its FFY 2006 IDEA grant award.</p> <p><u>Monitoring Reports</u></p> <p>As part of the <u>Special Conditions</u> imposed on the State’s FFY 2006 IDEA grant award, the State was also required to: (1) provide monitoring reports issued since July 1, 2006; (2) report the number of findings of noncompliance made in those reports; the corrective actions imposed; the number and percentage of those findings that have been corrected; and, the status of any remaining corrective actions, including actions undertaken by the State to ensure those corrective actions are being implemented and the compliance will be corrected within one year of identification.</p> <p>With its February 1, 2007 APR, the State provided copies of monitoring reports for the Elementary School division and reports for nine charter schools (Note: four of the charter schools are LEA charters; the remaining five charter schools are public schools of DCPS for IDEA purposes).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In its “General Supervision Response” and “LRE Response” included in the <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report, the State indicates the number of findings of noncompliance made in its monitoring of charter schools and the Elementary Schools Division; that correction action plans have been received; and, the one year time frame for correction has not expired. No findings of noncompliance identified since July 1, 2006 were reported as having been corrected.</p> <p>Based upon the review of the monitoring reports, OSEP continues to have concerns about the State’s monitoring system. Many of these concerns were also expressed in OSEP’s March 30, 2006 SPP response letter to the State, based at that time, upon a review of the monitoring reports issued to the High School and Middle/Junior High School Divisions in December 2005. OSEP’s concerns include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the charter school monitoring reports submitted by the State with its February 1, 2007 APR are dated July 12, 2006, copies provided to OSEP in November 2006 were undated. OSEP had previously been informed by the State that the charter school monitoring reports were issued on October 4, 2006. OSEP reiterates its concern that the State must ensure LEAs receive timely notification of noncompliance identified by the State through monitoring or other components of the State’s system of general supervision. • Some findings do not accurately reflect the legal requirements being monitored. For example, when addressing parental involvement requirements, on page 4 of the Kamit Institute Public Charter School monitoring report, the State found 46.67% of records reviewed “revealed that evaluation data was provided by parents.” While 34 CFR §§300.304(b), 300.305(a)(1) and 300.305(a)(2) require that a public agency consider information provided by parents, there is no legal requirement that parents provide evaluation data. The State was informed of this concern in OSEP’s March 30, 2006 SPP response letter. • The State continues to highlight as “significant compliance,” areas that should have been identified as noncompliance under the IDEA. For example, on page 5 of the Elementary Schools Division monitoring report, the State indicates, “84% of the records reviewed indicated that reevaluations were completed in a timely manner.” In the monitoring report for Paul Public Charter School, the State notes as a promising

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>practice that “87% of the records indicated that services needed are included in IEPs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State’s monitoring reports include conclusions that are not supported by the reported data. For example, on page 4 of the Friendship Public Charter Schools monitoring report, the State concludes the school “is compliant in providing FAPE in the LRE” and cites as an example of such compliance, that “97% of the records reviewed indicated that services identified during evaluations are included in the IEP.” However, on page 5 of that same report, the State concluded that of the records reviewed at the school, “47% indicated that children with disabilities placed in regular education for a full day do not receive the special education and related services specified in their IEPs.” <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005 (2005-2006). In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 12 and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State has demonstrated longstanding noncompliance related to implementation of its general supervision system. OSEP encourages the State to continue to access technical assistance available through the Mid-South Regional Resource Center and other OSEP-funded Technical Assistance Centers.</p> <p>The State provided its Final <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report on June 1, 2007. OSEP will respond to the State’s Progress Report with the State’s FFY 2007 grant award.</p>
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day	The State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator	The State revised its improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State did not submit its FFY 2005 data on Table 7 as required by the instructions for this indicator. It is OSEP's assumption that the data provided on page 26 of the FFY 2005 APR and entered on the State's "error checking worksheet" for Table 7 are the correct data for the FFY 2005 reporting period. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to achieve compliance.</p> <p>The State must submit its FFY 2006 State complaints data on Table 7 by the November 1, 2007 due date, and report on the State's compliance with the requirements of this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>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 in 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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 94.2%. Based on the State's data in Table 7, OSEP recalculated the FFY 2005 data to be 95.3%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 94.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State did not accurately calculate its FFY 2005 results for this indicator. OSEP recalculated the data based upon the State's raw data reported on Table 7 and on page 29 of the February 1, 2007 APR. The State had reported its data as 94.2%.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p> <p>The State's targets included in the SPP for this indicator are consistent with the indicator. However, the State included information about due process hearing timelines on page 72 of its SPP that does not accurately reflect the requirements for this indicator. The State indicated that it was reporting on the percent of fully adjudicated due process hearings that were fully adjudicated within the 75-day timeline or a timeline that was extended by the hearing officer at the request of a party. This indicator requires States to report on the 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. Under 34 §CFR 300.515(a), a public agency must ensure that no later than 45 days after the expiration of the 30 day period under §300.510(b) for the resolution process, or the adjusted time period described in §300.510(c), a final decision is reached and a copy of the decision is mailed to each of the parties. The State must ensure that the information submitted with its FFY 2006 February 1, 2008 APR is consistent with this indicator and the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>regulations at 34 CFR §300.515(a).</p> <p>Additionally, OSEP strongly encourages the State, with the involvement of its stakeholders, to revise the SPP to include improvement activities that will be implemented throughout the remaining SPP reporting periods. The improvement activities, timelines, and resources, are to be designed to assist the State in achieving compliance with the regulations at 34 CFR §300.515(a).</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's reported FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 3%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's reported data on page 31 of the February 1, 2007 APR and included on Table 7 indicate that the baseline data are 3%. However, on page 74 of the February 1, 2007 SPP, the State reports 22 of 55 resolution meetings resulted in resolution meeting settlement agreements (40%). OSEP encourages the State to revise the information in its SPP to reflect the correct FFY 2005 baseline data.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 23.1%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 15.5%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 17%.</p>	<p>The State did not submit its FFY 2005 data on Table 7 as required by the instructions for this indicator. It is OSEP's assumption that the data provided on page 33 of the FFY 2005 APR and entered on the State's "error checking worksheet" for Table 7 are the correct data for the FFY 2005 reporting period. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must submit its FFY 2006 mediation data on Table 7 by the November 1, 2007 due date, and report on the State's performance on this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicates that although it has submitted its 618 State reported data within the required timelines, the data for each of its submissions were not accurate. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100% timely and accurate</p>	<p>OSEP's March 30, 2006, FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR accurate data when reporting on the <u>percent of districts</u> under Indicators 3A, 4, 9, and 10.</p> <p>In its February 1, 2007 APR, the State did not provide data on the <u>percent of districts</u> under Indicators 4A and 9 as required by the instructions for those indicators. Additionally, the State did not provide FFY 2005 progress data for Indicators 2 and 3A, the required entry data for Indicator 7, and FFY 2005 baseline data for Indicator 11. The State's reported data for Indicator 1 were not consistent with the required measurement for that indicator. The</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	State reported data.	<p>State's reported data for Indicators 6 and 15 were not valid and reliable, for the reasons discussed in the analysis of those indicators. Finally, on page 13 of the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported that data from the charter LEAs are not included in Table 5 of the State's 618 State reported data and that this error has been corrected for the FFY 2006 APR.</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 in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 34 CFR 300.601(b).</p> <p>The State is encouraged to access technical assistance from the Mid-South Regional Resource Center and OSEP regarding the requirements for this indicator.</p>
High-Risk Special Conditions		
<p>High-Risk Special Conditions:</p> <p>Pursuant to 34 CFR §80.12, OSEP imposed <u>Special Conditions</u> on the State's FFY 2006 grant award under Part B of the IDEA (<u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u>), related to the State's noncompliance with the requirements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide timely initial evaluations and reevaluations (section 614(a)(1), (b) and (c) and 614(a)(2), (b) and (c) of IDEA and 34 CFR §§300.301(c)(1) and 300.303); • Implement due process hearing decisions in a timely manner (section 615(f) and (i)); • Ensure placement in the least restrictive environment (section 612(a)(5)(A) and 34 CFR §§300.114 through 300.120); and 		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and correct noncompliance with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600). <p>The noncompliance related to each <u>FFY 2006 Special Condition</u> is addressed below.</p> <p>Note: These issues were initially identified in the 1998-2001 Compliance Agreement between the State and the Department. All, with the exception of the identification and correction of noncompliance, have been <u>Special Conditions</u> on each grant award from 2001 to present.</p> <p><u>FFY 2006 Special Condition: Provide timely initial evaluations and reevaluations</u></p> <p>An initial evaluation that meets the requirements of section 614(a)(1), (b) and (c) of Part B of IDEA and 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) must be completed for all children with disabilities, and an appropriate placement must be made within the maximum number of days established by the State’s policy. At the end of the final reporting period for FFY 2005, 345 initial evaluations and placements had not been completed within the required timeline with an average number of overdue days of 56. The State reported that 33% of initial evaluations and placements were provided within the required timeline to children with disabilities whose initial evaluation deadlines fell within the final FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>For the June 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006 reporting period, the State reported that 228 initial evaluations and placements had not been completed within the required timeline, with an average number of overdue days of 112. The State reported that the percent of timely initial evaluations and placements provided to children with disabilities whose initial evaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period was 47%.</p>	<p>Data provided in the February 1, 2007 <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report reflect an increase in the percent of initial evaluations that were completed timely. However, the data indicate that only 47% of initial evaluations were completed within the required timeline. Although there has been a decrease in the percent of initial evaluations completed beyond the required timeline, the average of number of days that such initial evaluations were delayed is twice the number of days reported at the end of the FFY 2005 reporting period. In addition, OSEP cannot determine why the number reported in (d) is not (a) + (b) – (c).</p> <p>The State provided information in its February 1, 2007 Progress Report on the <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> demonstrating continued noncompliance with the requirements of section 614(a)(1), (b), and (c) and 614(a)(2), (b), and (c) of Part B of the IDEA and 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). The data demonstrate that the State has not yet satisfied this <u>Special Condition</u> in its FFY 2006 grant award.</p> <p>The State provided its Final <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report on June 1, 2007. OSEP will respond to the State’s Progress Report with the State’s FFY 2007 grant award.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A reevaluation that meets the requirements of section 614(a)(2), (b) and (c) of Part B of IDEA and 34 CFR §300.303 must be completed for all children with disabilities no later than three years after the date on which the previous evaluation or reevaluation was completed, unless the parent and the LEA agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary. At the end of the final reporting period for FFY 2005, 648 reevaluations had not been conducted in a timely manner, with an average number of overdue days of 69. The State reported that 32% of reevaluations were provided within the required timeline to children with disabilities whose reevaluation deadlines fell during the final FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>For the June 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006 reporting period, the State reported that 1,497 children had not been provided a timely reevaluation at the conclusion of the period, with an average number of overdue days of 115. The State reported that the percent of timely reevaluations provided to children whose reevaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period was 54%.</p>	<p>Data provided in the February 1, 2007 Progress Report reflect an increase in the percent of reevaluations that were completed timely. However, the data indicate that only 54% of reevaluations were completed within the required timeline. Although there has been a decrease in the percent of reevaluations completed beyond the required timeline, the average number of days that such reevaluations were delayed increased from 69 to 115 days. In addition, OSEP cannot determine why the number reported in (d) is not (a) + (b) – (c).</p> <p>The information provided by the State in its February 1, 2007 Progress Report on the <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> demonstrates continued noncompliance with the requirements of section 614(a)(2), (b), and (c) of Part B of IDEA and 34 CFR §300.303. The data demonstrate that the State has not yet satisfied this <u>Special Condition</u> in its FFY 2006 grant award.</p> <p>The State provided its Final <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report on June 1, 2007. OSEP will respond to the State’s Progress Report with the State’s FFY 2007 grant award.</p>
<p><u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions: Implement due process hearing decisions in a timely manner:</u></p> <p>Independent hearing officer decisions must be implemented within the timeframe prescribed by the hearing officer, or, if there is no timeframe prescribed by the hearing officer, within a reasonable timeframe set by the State, as required by sections 615(f) and (i) of Part B of the IDEA.</p> <p>At the end of the final reporting period for FFY 2005, 1,288 hearing decisions had not been implemented in a timely manner. The State reported that 22% of hearing officer determinations had been implemented in a timely manner during the final FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>At the end of the June 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006 reporting period, the State reported that 1,388 hearing decisions had not been implemented in a timely manner. The State reported that 32% of hearing officer decisions had been implemented in a timely manner during the reporting period.</p>	<p>The State provided information in its February 1, 2007 <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report demonstrating continued noncompliance with the requirements of section 615(f) and (i). This information demonstrated that, while the State has made progress (i.e., increased the percent of due process hearing decisions implemented in a timely manner) from the FFY 2005 final reporting period, it has not yet satisfied this <u>Special Condition</u> in its FFY 2006 grant award. In addition, OSEP cannot determine why the number reported in (d) is not (a) + (b) – (c).</p> <p>The State provided its Final <u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions</u> Progress Report on June 1, 2007. OSEP will respond to the State’s Progress Report with the State’s FFY 2007 grant award.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p><u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions: Ensure placement in the least restrictive environment:</u></p> <p>All children with disabilities must be placed in the least restrictive environment appropriate to their individual needs, as required by section 612(a)(5)(A) of the IDEA and 34 CFR §§300.114 through 300.120. Under the <u>FFY 2005 Special Conditions</u>, the State was required to provide OSEP with monitoring reports issued as a result of the first cyclical monitoring of the High School and Middle/Junior High School divisions and monitoring data for all elementary schools monitored through the spring 2005, highlighting any findings and corrective action plans related to placement of children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.</p> <p>The State’s submissions to OSEP during the FFY 2005 reporting period did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the State is monitoring its local educational agencies for compliance with each of the least restrictive environment provisions of the IDEA. Further, in those instances when the State did identify noncompliance, there was no evidence that it ordered corrective measures to ensure correction of the noncompliance related to the least restrictive environment provisions.</p> <p>OSEP’s July 11, 2006 grant award letter required the State, as part of its response to Indicator 15, to provide data that include the number of findings of noncompliance the State identified in its December 8, 2005 monitoring reports related to the implementation of least restrictive environment requirements and the</p>	<p>See Indicator 15</p>	<p>See Indicator 15</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>number and percentage of these findings that were corrected within one year of identification. In addition, OSEP required the State to provide an explanation of the process, including standards, used to calculate the levels of compliance reported in the June 27, 2006 Addendum to the State's June 16, 2006 Final Progress Report related to implementation of the least restrictive environment requirements in the High and Middle/Junior High School divisions.</p>		
<p><u>FFY 2006 Special Conditions: Failure to identify and correct noncompliance:</u></p> <p>The State must identify noncompliance with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA and correct identified deficiencies in a timely manner in accordance with section 612(a)(11) of the IDEA, 34 CFR §300.149, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3). The State must have in effect policies and procedures to ensure that it complies with the monitoring and enforcement requirements in 34 CFR §§300.600 through 300.602 and 300.606 through 300.608.</p> <p>Under the <u>FFY 2005 Special Conditions</u>, OSEP required the State to submit monitoring report(s) issued as a result of its first cyclical monitoring of the High School and Middle/Junior High School divisions, and monitoring data for all elementary schools, including charter schools that are public schools of DCPS, and charter schools established as local educational agencies. OSEP required that the documentation include corrective actions imposed; activities undertaken by the State to ensure corrected actions are implemented and identified</p>	<p>See Indicator 15</p>	<p>See Indicator 15</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>noncompliance was corrected within one year of identification; and the mechanisms the State has in place to address persistent noncompliance (sanctions) and how and when they are imposed.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 submissions demonstrate that while the State has initiated a process for monitoring its local educational agencies, concerns remain about whether the State is effectively identifying noncompliance and requiring corrective actions to ensure noncompliance is corrected consistent with the requirements.</p> <p>OSEP's July 11, 2006 grant award letter required the State, as part of its response to Indicator 15, to: (1) report data that include findings of noncompliance identified in the December 8, 2005 monitoring reports, and the number of corrections the State verified were completed no later than one year from identification; (2) provide a description of actions taken, including enforcement actions, for any uncorrected noncompliance identified in the December 8, 2005 monitoring reports; and (3) provide monitoring reports issued since July 1, 2006 and for those reports, provide the number of findings of noncompliance made, corrective actions imposed, number and percentage of findings corrected, status of any remaining corrective actions, and any actions undertaken to ensure timely correction will occur.</p>		