

Illinois 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 show a 10.6% gap between the graduation rate for students with disabilities and the rate for all students (77.2% for students with disabilities as compared to 87.8% for all students). The State met its FFY 2005 target to reduce the gap between students with disabilities and all students to no more than 11%.</p>	<p>The State added to and revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not submit actual numbers for this indicator and the State must provide both the percentage and the actual numbers in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 show a 1.1% gap between the drop out rate for students with disabilities and the rate for all students (5.0% for students with disabilities as compared to 3.9% for all students). The State met its FFY 2005 target of reducing the gap between students with and without disabilities to no more than 1.85%.</p>	<p>The State added to the improvement activities 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</p>	<p>No data provided.</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>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 submit data for this indicator, explaining that data were not yet available. The State has a plan for collecting the FFY 2005 progress data.</p> <p>The State must provide the required FFY 2005 progress data and progress data from FFY 2006 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 APR reported a participation rate of 98.8% for both Reading and Math in grades 3-8. The State did not include participation data for 11th grade in the APR or Table 6. Therefore, the State’s data were not valid and reliable, and OSEP could not determine whether the State met its FFY 2005 target of 95% or made progress.</p>	<p>The State added to its improvement activities and timelines for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not submit data for 11th grade. The State has a plan for collecting the data. The State must provide the required FFY 2005 progress data for the 11th grade and progress data from FFY 2006 for all grade levels in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</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 31.1-38.6% for Reading and 33.9-60.9% for Math. These data show that students with disabilities in grades 3, 4, 6, and 8 met the target in Reading, and students in grades 3-7 met the target in Math. However, the data were not valid and reliable, because the proficiency data for 11th grade were not included in the APR or Table 6. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether</p>	<p>The State added to its improvement activities and timelines for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State did not submit data for 11th grade. The State has a plan for collecting the data. The State must provide the required FFY 2005 data for 11th grade, and FFY 2006 data for all grade levels.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	or not the State met its FFY 2005 target of 34% for Reading or 36% for Math, or made progress.	
<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 4.82%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 5%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.146(b) (now 34 CFR §300.170(b)), because the State had not provided the results of its review of policies and procedures for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2004. The State reported that it notified the 63 districts identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2004 and the districts provided reviews and analyses of their data to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). However, the State did not indicate, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), that it reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, procedures and practices relating to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in FYY 2004 or those LEAs identified in FFY 2005. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b). To correct this noncompliance, the State must describe in the FFY 2006 APR the review, and if appropriate revision of policies, practices and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA for: (1) the 63 districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2004 APR; and (2) the 42 districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR. In its FFY 2006 APR, 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: the 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 that review in the FFY 2006 APR.)</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[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:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <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>A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 49.3%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 48%.</p> <p>B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 18.9%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 20.5%.</p> <p>C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 5.9%. The FFY 2004 data were also 5.9%. The State did not meet its</p>	<p>The State added to its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>A. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>B. The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>C. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	FFY 2005 target of 5.57%.	
<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 62%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 66.18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 67%.</p>	<p>The State added to its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 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>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 did not provide FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator in the SPP/APR.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>In a subsequent April 20, 2007 letter, the State provided baseline data. The State's FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 26%.</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>The State identified one district with disproportionate representation in special education and related</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State identified one district with significant disproportionate representation of black students in special education and related services but did not determine if the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator; New]	services.	<p>disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3).</p> <p>In reporting on disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, the State reported that it reviewed data for some, but not all, race ethnicity categories present in the State. Illinois defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education as students in a particular non-white racial/ethnic group being at significantly greater risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services than all other racial/ethnic groups, including white students, enrolled either in the district or in the State. 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. Therefore, because the State did not review data for white students, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State, in its FFY 2006 APR, must describe and report on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories, including white students, in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that in order to determine “as a result of inappropriate identification,” the State will require identified districts to conduct self-assessment activities and then submit the result of those activities to the State. Upon receipt, the State will review the district documentation and, combined with the district data, will verify whether or not the significant disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification. The State indicated that it would have verified baseline data by May 2007.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of 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, practices and procedures, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>The State reported on districts with possible <i>significant disproportionate representation</i> (italics added). States have the discretion to define “disproportionate representation” and Illinois appears to define “disproportionate representation” in the same way it defines “significant disproportionality.” While this is permissible, it is important to note that under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), when a State identifies LEAs with significant disproportionality with respect to the identification, placement, or discipline of children as children with disabilities, the State must: (1) provide for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; (2) require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and (3) require the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices, even if the significant disproportionality is not the result of inappropriate identification. It appears that Illinois is not carrying out all of these activities if the significant disproportionality is not the result of inappropriate identification. Because the State provided information in its FFY 2005 APR that indicates it may not be in compliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), the State must clarify in its FFY 2006 APR that when it determines that significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA, the State carries out the activities required by 34 CFR §300.646(b).</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 30 districts with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified 30 districts with significant disproportionate representation of one or more racial and ethnic groups in one or more specific disability categories, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3).</p> <p>In reporting on disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification, the State reported that it reviewed data for some but not all race ethnicity categories present in the State. Illinois defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disability categories as students in a particular non-white racial/ethnic group being at significantly greater risk of being identified in a specific disability category than all other racial/ethnic groups, including white students, enrolled either in the district or in the State. 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. Therefore, because the State did not review data for white students, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State, in its FFY 2006 APR, must describe and report on, its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories, including white students, in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that in order to determine “as a result of inappropriate identification,” the State will require identified districts to conduct self-assessment activities and then submit the result of those activities to the State. Upon receipt, the State will review the district documentation and, combined with the district data, will verify whether or not the significant disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification. The State indicated that it would have verified baseline data by May 2007.</p> <p>The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts 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, practices and procedures, etc.). The State must also provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts 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>The State reported on districts with possible <i>significant disproportionate representation</i> (italics added). States have the discretion to define “disproportionate representation” and Illinois appears to define</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>“disproportionate representation” in the same way it defines “significant disproportionality.” While this is permissible, it is important to note that under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), when a State identifies LEAs with significant disproportionality with respect to the identification, placement, or discipline of children as children with disabilities, the State must: 1) provide for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; 2) require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and 3) require the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices, even if the significant disproportionality is not the result of inappropriate identification. It appears Illinois is not carrying out all of these activities if the significant disproportionality is not the result of inappropriate identification. Because the State provided information in its FFY 2005 APR that indicates it may not be in compliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), the State must clarify in its FFY 2006 APR that when it determines that significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA, the State carries out the activities required by 34 CFR §300.646(b).</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</p>		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State’s reported FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 64.2%.</p>	<p>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 timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>The State did not, as required by the measurement for this indicator, account for children whose initial evaluation was not completed within 60 calendar days, by indicating the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and the reasons for the delay. The State must provide the required information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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), 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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 80.21%. This</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 81.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to priority areas (37 of 42 were timely corrected within one year from identification, and the remaining five were subsequently corrected).</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR complete baseline data from FFY 2004, and progress data from FFY 2005. The State provided all required information, including the range of delays and the reasons for delays in determining eligibility.</p> <p>In calculating the target data for 05-06, the State did not deduct the number of children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services. Therefore OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 80.21% (instead of the reported 76.65%).</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 full compliance with this requirement, including correction of 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. [Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 baseline data for this indicator are 24.5%.</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 compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance 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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>A plan that describes how data will be collected was provided.</p>	<p>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.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator calculate to 86.22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2004 data, which calculate to 22.33%.</p>	<p>The State did not revise its baseline, targets and actual target data to collapse 15A, B, and C. As noted in the Status column, OSEP collapsed the data for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. The State must provide the required data measurement in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State reported on correction of noncompliance "found through the complaint process." The State must clarify, in the FFY 2006 APR due</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>February 1, 2008, that this includes findings of noncompliance made through due process hearings.</p> <p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit data to OSEP that demonstrated compliance with this requirement by June 1, 2006. The data provided in the June 1, 2006 progress report, and in the June 15, 2006 addendum to that progress report, demonstrated improvement in the correction of identified noncompliance, as required in 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2). The State reported that 84% of findings identified in FFY 2003 had been corrected within one year of identification. For those findings that had not been corrected at the time of the progress report, the State provided detailed information on action it was taking to ensure correction. OSEP's July 1, 2006 grant award letter required the State to include data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrated compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2), specifically showing that findings of district-level noncompliance were being corrected within one year.</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 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 provide: (1) data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2003; (2) data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified through the complaint process in FFY 2004; and (3) data, disaggregated by APR indicator, on 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.</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 95.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<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 in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 90.9%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 71.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the timelines for the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to provide a progress report to OSEP in April 2006 showing that it had corrected the noncompliance related to the requirements of 34 CFR §300.511(a) and (c). OSEP's July 1, 2006 grant award letter acknowledged the State's report showing that 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests received between July 1 and December 31, 2005 were fully adjudicated within the required timeline or one that was properly extended by the hearing officer.</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 §300.515(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 FFY 2005 baseline data are 62.5%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</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 79%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 77.5%.</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2005 target, and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that it met its FFY 2005 target of 100%. However, the State did not provide in the APR valid and reliable data for Indicator 3 and did not provide timely data for Indicator 8.</p> <p>The State must provide the data, in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>