Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status		OSEP Analys	sis/Next Steps	
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE					
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. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 50.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 48.0%.	The State revised the OSEP accepts those The State met its tall performance.	e revisions.		
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. [Results Indicator]	No data provided for FFY 2005. OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its target or progress was made.	The State revised the indicator in its SPP OSEP's February 1 to include in the Fe and progress data from (WDE) provided by 2004 reported data on page 5 of the AF collection of drop-overification and cle Therefore, WDE die to collect that data. WDE must provide from FFY 2006 in the SPP 2006 in the SPP in the SPP in the service of the SPP 2006 in the service of t	OSEP accepts the 7, 2006 SPP respondence 1, 2007 API rom FFY 2005. We aseline data from FI for this indicator at PR, that it is in the pout data for students an-up of the data for d not include progress the required FFY 2	ose revisions. The selection of the sel	required the State a from FFY 2004 t of Education d. The State's FFY r, WDE reported, the timing of its a order to allow for omission.
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data indicates that the State met targets for Elementary School math and Middle School language arts. State did not meet targets for FFY 2005 for Elementary School language arts, Middle School math, and High School language arts and math.	The State revised the OSEP accepts those The State's FFY 20 indicator are: Elementary Language Arts	e revisions.		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status		OSEP Analys	sis/Next Steps	
		Elementary Math	62.5%	65%	93.3%
		Middle School Language Arts	33.3%	35%	35.7%
		Middle School Math	44.4%	45%	33.3%
		High School Language Arts	33.3%	35%	0.0%
		High School Math	0.0%	10%	0.0%
		OSEP looks forwar performance in the			
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations;	The State's FFY 2005 reported data ranges from 95.2% to 98.8%. The State did not meet its targets of 100%.	The State revised the OSEP accepts those The State's FFY 20 indicator are:			
regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.			FFY 2004 Baseline	FFY 2005 Target	FFY 2005 Reported Data
[Results Indicator]		Elementary Reading	99.1%	100.0%	98.8%
		Elementary Math	99.2%	100.0%	98.7%
		Middle School Reading	99.0%	100.0%	97.8%

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status		OSEP Analys	sis/Next Steps					
		Middle School Math	99.0%	100.0%	97.9%				
		High School Reading	98.9%	100.0%	95.5%				
		High School Math	98.7%	100.0%	95.2%				
		OSEP looks forwar performance in the							
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate	The State's FFY 2005 reported data indicates targets met for Elementary School math.	The State revised the OSEP accepts those The State's FFY 20 indicator are:	e revisions.						
achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	State did not meet target for Elementary School reading, Middle School reading and math, and High School reading and math.	Elementary School reading, Middle School reading and math, and High School	Elementary School reading, Middle School reading and math, and High School		FFY 2004 Baseline	FFY 2005 Target	FFY 2005 Reported Data		
				Elementary Reading	14.8%	42.0%	29.5%		
				Elementary Math	20.1%	36.5%	40.6%		
						Middle School Reading	9.5%	45.42%	21.3%
				Middle School Math	8.0%	37.75%	17.6%		
		High School Reading	10.5%	57.0%	19.9%				

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status		OSEP Analy	sis/Next Steps	
		High School Math	8.3%	46.5%	15.1%
		targets and OSEP l	ooks forward to the	dicator. The State re State's data demor FY 2006 APR, due	nstrating
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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 [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 0%.	this indicator in its indicator from comwith and without discomparing suspens accepts those revision OSEP's February Inoncompliance with \$300.170(b), because policies, procedure significant discrepated full compliance with WDE reported that discrepancies in the policies and procedure and if appropriate relating to develop behavioral intervent represents noncompliance, the reviewed, and if apprevise) policies, pratopics: development behavioral intervent the two districts it is 2004 APR; and (2)	spp. WDE also resparing suspension is abilities within lotion and expulsion rations. 7, 2006 FFY SPP of the requirements are the State did not a sand practices in the sand practices. However, the sand implement and implement and implement and implementations and supports and implementations are supports.	in the February 1, 2 ts it identified as have t conducted a review	tion for this between students ites (LEAs) to in the State. OSEP de B, identified de(b), now 34 CFR of its review of fied as having TDE to demonstrate 2007 APR. It wing significant who of the districts' that the review, it deprocedures use of positive eguards. This correct this 2006 APR that it has sted LEAs to of the following of positive eguards: (1) for ancies in the FFY ignificant

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR.)
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 disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator; New]		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.
 5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5A are 55.54%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 55.81%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	56.00%. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5B are 9.15%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 9.55%.	
	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 5C	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	are 2.63%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 2.47%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 2.46%.	
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). [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 71.03%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 69.84%.	The State revised the target (for FFY 2010) and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. 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.
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]	Entry data provided.	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.
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. [Results Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 80.7% (school aged) and 70.2% (preschool).	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State did not submit raw data. The State did not provide the number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement, or the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities. (On page 46 of the SPP, WDE did provide the number of preschool parent surveys that were completed.) The State must provide all of the required data in the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
		OSEP's February 17, 2006 SPP response letter, Table A, did not approve WDE's sampling plan for Indicator 8. OSEP required WDE to submit a revised sampling plan prior to, or with the February 1, 2007 FFY 2005 APR submission. WDE did not submit a revised sampling plan. Call your State Contact as soon as possible.
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in	The State identified 0% of districts with disproportionate	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.
special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	representation.	The State reported that no districts were identified at the "disproportionate"
[Compliance Indicator; New]		or "significant disproportionality" levels. Because the State reviewed the data and determined that no district had "disproportionate representation," it did not have to determine whether identified disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.
		WDE described how it places a district in the caution, disproportionate or significant disproportionality level. However, it did not include, as required by the instructions for Indicator 9, the State's definition of "disproportionate representation." The State must include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, which levels it considers "disproportionate representation."
		While not required under Indicator 9, WDE reported that following an onsite review, it <i>may</i> require any district falling into the "Significant Disproportionality" category to use 15% of the district's Part B 611 funds for comprehensive, coordinated early intervening services as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b) (italics added).
		This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), which requires that if the State determines that significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA, the State must require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount for early intervening services, regardless of the result of an on-site review. Because the State provided information in its FFY 2005 APR that indicates noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), 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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2).
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]	The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 0%.	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported that four districts fell into the disproportionate level and were required to explain policies, procedures, and practices for identification of students with disabilities. Four districts were placed in the significant disproportionality level and these districts were required to complete the risk-based self-assessment and participate in a file review with WDE staff. The State reported that through this process, it found no districts to have significant disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification (italics added). Indicator 10 requires that States report on the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not include, as required by the measurement for Indicator 10, the State's definition of "disproportionate representation." As noted above, the State must include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, which levels it considers "disproportionate representation." WDE reported that following an on-site review, it may require any district falling into the "Significant Disproportionality" category to use 15% of the district's Part B 611 funds for comprehensive, coordinated early intervening services as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b) (italics added). See discussion in Indicator 9.
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Super	vision	
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 77.8% (74.5% for school-age students and 93.6% for preschool students).	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based on a State-established timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 68.29%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 97.69%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. The State reported timely correction of all areas of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP's February 17, 2006 SPP response letter required WDE to submit data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrated full compliance with the requirement at 34 CFR §300.132 (now 34 CFR §300.124). In Indicator 15, the State reported that all areas of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 were corrected in a timely manner. 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 34 CFR §300.124, including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.
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. [Compliance Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 50.8%.	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.
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. [Results Indicator; New]	The State provided a plan for how data will be collected.	The State provided a plan that describes how this data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
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	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
from identification. [Compliance Indicator]		OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate continuing 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 specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported there were no complaints filed in FFY 2005.	The State reported there were no complaints filed in FFY 2005.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, based on one fully adjudicated due process hearing. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator; New]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, based on two resolution sessions.	The State reported that there were two resolution sessions requested and held during the reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings were held.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.[Results Indicator]	The State reported no mediations were held in FFY 2005.	The State reported that there were no mediations requested or held during the reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations are conducted.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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 100%. The State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	OSEP's February 17, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required WDE to revise its targets in the APR to clarify that it is the State's intent to reach 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness regarding data reported under section 618 of the IDEA. The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP's February 17, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005 in the February 1, 2007 APR. WDE submitted the baseline and progress data with the APR. Although the State noted that the APR was timely, the State did not provide data for Indicator 2. The State must provide 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).