

### Missouri Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>		
<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 SPP reported data for this indicator are 70.3%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 69.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 73.0%.</p>	<p>The State revised its baseline data and added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 2, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include the Department of Correction (DOC) and Division of Youth Services (DYS) students in the baseline data for this indicator. OSEP's letter further required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) a narrative describing the conditions that youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma (with an explanation of why they are different); and (2) 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). The State included the required data and information in the APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance 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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 5.6%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 5.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 4.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) a narrative describing what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs (with an explanation of why they are different); (2) DOC and DYS students in the baseline data for this indicator for purposes of baseline data and setting of future targets; and (3) 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). The State included the required data and information in the APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance 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</p>	<p>The State revised its targets and added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>are 32.2%. The State met its revised FFY 2005 target of 30.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to provide, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both accurate 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). The State indicated in the APR that the baseline data provided in the SPP for 2004-2005 were accurate.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to provide documentation in the FFY 2005 APR showing correction of the identified noncompliance in the two remaining districts related to ensuring that all children with disabilities who take the alternate to the statewide assessment participate in all of the same areas of assessment as children who take the State’s general assessment. The State reported in the APR that the two districts were cleared of the noncompliance within one year from the date of the State’s February 2006 report.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to provide documentation in the FFY 2005 APR showing correction of the identified noncompliance in the five remaining districts related to ensuring that children with disabilities participate in the districtwide assessment. The State reported in the APR that the five districts were cleared of the noncompliance within one year from the date of the State’s February 2006 progress report.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <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>The State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator in both Math and Communication Arts are 99.3%. The State met its FFY 2005 target.</p>	<p>The State revised its targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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</p>	<p>The State revised its targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>are 15.9% (Communication Arts); and 18.7% (Math). This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 11.2% (Communication Arts) and 11.0% (Math). The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 34.7% (Communication Arts) and 26.6% (Math).</p>	<p>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 2.11%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 1.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.7%.</p>	<p>The State reported on page 17 of the APR that, in the 10 districts identified in the SPP as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates in 2004-2005, data verifications resulted in four districts being dropped and onsite file reviews of policies, practices, and procedures in the remaining six districts. The State made findings of noncompliance in five of those six districts and required corrective action plans that will correct noncompliance within one year and improvement plans that will address discipline and behavior management within the district. The State reported that noncompliance had been corrected in the sixth district.</p> <p>The State described its process for determining if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of suspension/expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. This process does not permit the State to make an annual determination of significant discrepancy, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(a). The State reported that a district will not be determined to have significant discrepancies unless the discrepancies occur for two years in a row. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(a). In making a determination of significant discrepancy under 34 CFR §300.170, a State may utilize numerical data collected over more than one year, however, in order to ensure compliance with 34 CFR §300.170, the State must make an annual determination of whether significant discrepancies are occurring. The State must demonstrate in its FFY 2006 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected. To correct this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate that it makes an annual determination of whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions/expulsions are occurring either among its LEAs or compared to the rates of nondisabled children within those agencies, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(a).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State indicated that it reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices for districts with significant discrepancies, and that districts with noncompliance were required to implement corrective action, but did not indicate that the review, and if appropriate revisions, covered policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2006 APR that when it identified significant discrepancies it has reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:  B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.  [Results Indicator; New]</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, 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;</p>	<p>5A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 57.4%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 58.05%. The State did not</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State met its target for Indicator 5B and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>meet its FFY 2005 target of 59%</p> <p>5B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5B are 11.2% (FFY 2004 data were 11.16%). The State met its FFY 2005 target of 11%.</p> <p>5C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5C are 3.7% This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 3.52%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 3.50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance for Indicators 5A and 5C in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 45.4%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 43%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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, 2008.</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 provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not provide criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" that were required by the instructions for the SPP/APR to be included in the FFY 2006 APR. The State must describe how it will determine outcomes to be comparable to same-aged peers in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving</p>	<p>The State reported baseline</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>data of 76.49%.</p>	<p>OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b></p>		
<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 provided data on the percent of all districts with “significant disproportionality in special education with inappropriate identification.”</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported on page 30 of the SPP that its methodology for determining “significant disproportionality” includes the examination of a variety of factors to identify disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. The State further reported that a district is considered to have significant disproportionate representation if four or more categories (total special education, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, speech/language impairment, other health impairment, autism, and self-contained placements) were identified as disproportionate for two years in a row. The State reported that 13 districts were identified in 2004-2005 as having significant disproportionality and reviews were conducted in 11 of those districts in 2006. The remaining two districts were reviewed by the Department’s Office for Civil Rights and neither was found to be in violation. The State reported that six of the 11 districts were found to have inappropriate identification and were required to submit additional documentation to determine if corrective action would be taken.</p> <p>The State reported the percent of districts with significant disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 9 requires that States report on the percent of districts with <i>disproportionate representation</i> of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State must include, in its FFY 2006 APR, its definition of disproportionate representation and describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>practices and procedures, etc.).</p> <p>On page 31 of the SPP, the State described the Missouri Disproportionality Collaborative's (MODAC's) review of policies, procedures and practices for those districts identified as having disproportionate representation of students identified as eligible for special education or of students who receive special education and related services in restrictive placements and the criteria used to determine if those districts had policies, practices and procedures in place to prevent such disproportionate representation of those students. The State provided data on the percent of all districts with "significant disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services with inappropriate identification," but did not describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The measurement for Indicator 9 requires States to include a description of how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc. The State must describe, in its FFY 2006 APR, how the State made that determination for districts identified in the FFY 2005 APR. The State must also describe, in its FFY 2006 APR, how the State makes that determination for districts identified in the FFY 2006 APR, even if the determination occurs in the Fall of 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it only analyzed data on the overidentification of Black students in special education and related services. The State also reported that other racial/ethnic groups do not show significant disproportionality at the State level and therefore were not examined at the district level. Indicator 9, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires States to identify disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of races and ethnicities in special education and related services. Further, under 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3) a State may, in reviewing data for each race ethnicity category, do so in a statistically appropriate manner, and may set an "n" size that applies to all racial and ethnic groups, but it must review data for all race ethnicity categories in the State and must do the analysis at the LEA level for all race and ethnic groups meeting that "n" size that are present in any of its LEAs. Finally, Indicator 9, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires the State to collect and examine data at both the State and district level to determine the percent</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Therefore, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information demonstrating that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation for all race ethnicity categories in the State and the LEAs to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>While not required under Indicator 9, the State described its process for determining if significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification and placement. The process does not permit the State to make an annual determination of significant disproportionality, as required by 34 CFR §300.646. The State reported that a district is considered to have significant disproportionate representation if four or more categories were identified as disproportionate for two years in a row. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646. In making a determination of significant disproportionality under 34 CFR §300.646, a State may utilize numerical data collected over more than one year, however, in order to ensure compliance with 34 CFR §300.646, the State must make an annual determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions. Because the State provided information in its FFY 2005 APR that indicates noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646, the State must demonstrate in its FFY 2006 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected. To correct this noncompliance the State must demonstrate, in its FFY 2006 APR, that it makes an annual determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, as required by 34 CFR §300.646.</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. [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided data on the percent of districts with “significant disproportionality in specific disability categories with inappropriate identification.”</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that it uses the same process to determine significant disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification for Indicators 9 and 10. Please refer to the OSEP Analysis/Next Steps column in Indicator 9 for the information the State must provide in the FFY 2006</p>



Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>On page 33 of the SPP, the State reported that the identification process used combines overall special education data with data by disability category and that a district is considered to have significant disproportionate representation if four or more categories (total special education, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, speech/language impairment, other health impairment, autism, and self-contained placements) were identified as disproportionate for two years in a row. All 13 districts identified to have significant disproportionate representation in 2004-2005 had at least two disability categories with disproportionate data in addition to disproportionality in overall special education data.</p> <p>The State reported that a district is considered to have significant disproportionate representation only if four or more categories are identified as disproportionate for two years in a row. Indicator 10, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires States to identify disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Therefore, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information demonstrating that it has examined data and made determinations for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for at least the specific disability categories listed in the instructions for Indicator 10.</p>
<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</b>		
<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's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 94.7%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State appears to be reporting data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>The State reported that 3,632 of 4,107 evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline, which calculates to 88.43%. The State further reported that the evaluation was completed for an additional 259 children beyond the 60-day timeline for "acceptable reasons," and included these 259 children in its calculation of its 94.7% baseline for this indicator. The State indicated that approximately 75% of "acceptable explanations" for exceeding</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>timelines involved school breaks, holidays, snow days, etc., and that another common explanation was parent or student delays, including absences, family emergencies, etc.</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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 95.4%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 93.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 of 34 CFR §300.124.</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 reported baseline data of 44.8%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of compliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<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>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>While the State provided its definition of "competitive employment," it did not provide a definition for post-secondary education.</p> <p>In its FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must include its definition of post-secondary education.</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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 32.29%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 75.2%. The State did</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to provide with its FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, data showing correction of the noncompliance with respect to the provision of services to youth with disabilities incarcerated in local city/county jails in the remaining district with outstanding noncompliance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>The State reported in the APR that it had received documentation that the district had corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's March 2, 2006 letter also required the State to submit data, by June 1, 2006, demonstrating compliance with the requirement to ensure correction of noncompliance within one year of identification. With a May 31, 2006 letter, the State reported that it ensured the correction of 71% of findings within one year of identification made in FFY 2003, and that it had ensured the correction of all of that noncompliance by June 1, 2006.</p> <p>In the APR, the State provided a list of procedures in place to assure that the follow-up reviews are conducted and noncompliance corrected within 12 months. The State also provided additional data showing that as of January 31, 2007, 95.59% of findings made in 2004-2005 had been corrected, and provided detailed information regarding the actions, including sanctions, that it is taking to ensure correction in the remaining seven districts.</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 of 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, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2006 APR, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152.
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	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance, and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]	FFY 2005 target of 100%.	§300.515(a).
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator; New]	The State reported baseline data of 46.9%.	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 66.7%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 62%.	The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP'S March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) for both timeliness and accuracy. The State provided the required data.</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 300.601(b).</p>