

## Rhode Island 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 reported data for this indicator are 73.46%. These data appear to indicate the State met its FFY 2005 target of 72.89%. However, the data are not valid and reliable because of State-identified concerns about the accuracy of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) an overview of the issue and a description of the process and system for this indicator; (2) both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005; (3) a description of the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma; (4) a description of how graduation rates are calculated; and (5) a description of what the percentages listed in the measurable and rigorous targets represent. The State's FFY 2005 APR included the required information and OSEP appreciates the State's response.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter also advised the State that it should review its activities to determine if additional activities are needed, or if the activity needs to be revised or modified, to have the desired effect. The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>On page 5 of the FFY 2005 APR, the State reported concerns about the accuracy of its data for this indicator. The State must provide the required data for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. OSEP suggests that the State review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include valid and reliable 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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 26.54%. These data appear to indicate the State met its FFY 2005 target of 27.11%. However, the data are not valid and reliable because of State-identified concerns about the accuracy of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) an overview of the issue and a description of the process and system for this indicator; (2) both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005; (3) a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs; if there is a difference, provide an explanation of the reasons why; and, (4) a description of what the percentages listed in the measurable and rigorous targets represent. The State's FFY 2005 APR included the required</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>information and OSEP appreciates the State's response.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter also advised the State that it should review its activities to determine if additional activities are needed, or if the activity needs to be revised or modified, to have the desired effect. The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>On page 12 of the APR, the State reported concerns about the accuracy of its data for this indicator. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. OSEP suggests that the State review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include valid and reliable 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>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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 63.89%. OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its FFY 2005 target of 71% for English Language Arts (ELA) and 65% for Mathematics because of differences in how the State reported its FFY 2004 baseline data and FFY 2005 progress data.</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target or made progress because the State's FFY 2004 baseline data were disaggregated by content area (ELA and Mathematics) and the FFY 2005 data combined both of the content areas.</p> <p>The State revised its targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP posted on its website is revised to reflect these changes.</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 are 98.3% for Mathematics and 98.5% for ELA. The State's FFY 2005 APR data represent slippage from the State's FFY 2004 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP considered the disaggregated data (for Mathematics and ELA) reported on pages 15-16 of the FFY 2005 APR, which are consistent with Table 6 (the State's 618 data), and not the 98.7% participation rate for both ELA and Mathematics reported on page 14 of the APR. The instructions for this indicator require that participation rates be reported by content area for each of the grades shown in Table 6 of the State's 618 data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 for grade 11 students are 23.6% for ELA and 15.1% for Mathematics. The State met its FFY 2005 target for grade 11 students of 21% for ELA and 13% for Mathematics.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for the performance of children who participated in the State's alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>During FFY 2005, the State implemented a new statewide assessment, the New England Common Assessment Program, for students in grades three through eight. As a result, the State established baseline and targets for these grades and revised its improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts those changes and reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP posted on its website is revised to reflect the new baseline data and revised targets.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, information that demonstrates the State ensured the public reporting of participation and performance of children with IEPs on State and districtwide assessments with the same frequency and detail as reported on assessments of children without disabilities. This action was required because in its SPP, the State's baseline data for the proficiency rate for children on alternate assessments was based upon an aggregated score for ELA and Mathematics, rather than disaggregated by content area.</p> <p>OSEP considered the data on pages 16-17 of the FFY 2005 APR regarding the proficiency rate for children with IEPs in Grade 11 for Mathematics and ELA, which were consistent with Table 6 (the State's 618 data), and not the data reported on page 18 of the FFY 2005 APR (proficiency for 11<sup>th</sup> grade students in FFY 2005 increased from 12% to 14.4% in Mathematics and from 20% to 22.4% in ELA). Additionally, OSEP was unable to locate information that demonstrates the State is reporting publicly on the participation and performance of children with IEPs in alternate assessments for the FFY 2005 reporting period as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16).</p> <p>The State must provide the required data, analysis, and explanation of progress or slippage related to the proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards <u>and</u> the State's alternate assessment in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State must also submit documentation that it is reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the performance of children in alternate assessments as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16) in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State reporting complete data in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 14%. These data appear to indicate the State met its FFY 2005 target of 15%. However, the data are not valid and reliable because of State-identified concerns about the accuracy of the data.</p>	<p>The State identified concerns about the accuracy and comparability of the data for this indicator from year to year. On page 24 of the APR, the State acknowledged variances in its data collection from prior years and indicated concerns about implementation of the State's new data collection system.</p> <p>The State was instructed in Table A of OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter to describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) its 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2004. The State did not provide this information. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>To correct this noncompliance, in its FFY 2006 APR, the State must 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: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP suggests that the State review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include valid and reliable data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 64% with a standard deviation among districts of 13%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 62.8% with a standard deviation among districts of 14%. The State did not meet its overall FFY 2005 target of 65% or higher with a standard deviation among districts of 13% or lower.</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>5B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>For Indicator 5B in the APR, the State reported FFY 2005 data of 15% with a standard deviation among districts of 7.6%. The State's 618 data for FFY 2005 are 18.27%. The 618 data for FFY 2005 represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 18.9%.</p> <p>Based on the State's 618 data, the State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 18% or lower with a standard deviation</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR data are inconsistent with the State's 618 data, therefore OSEP used the 618 data to determine whether the FFY 2005 target was met. In the FFY 2006 APR for this indicator, the State must report data that are consistent with its 618 data.</p> <p>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
	among districts of 7% or lower.	
<p>5C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>For Indicator 5C in the APR, the State reported FFY 2005 data of 3.92%. The State's 618 data for FFY 2005 are 4.25%. The State's 618 FFY 2005 data represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 4.7%.</p> <p>Based on the State's 618 data, the State met its FFY 2005 target of 4.5% or lower.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR data are inconsistent with the State's 618 data, therefore OSEP used the 618 data to determine whether the FFY 2005 target was met. In the FFY 2006 APR for this indicator, the State must report data that are consistent with its 618 data.</p> <p>Based on the State's 618 data, the State met its target for this indicator and OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance 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 reported FFY 2005 data for this indicator are 38%. The State's 618 data for FFY are 83.5%. OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its FFY 2005 target or made progress.</p>	<p>OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its FFY 2005 target for this indicator because the State's FFY 2005 data reported in the February 1, 2007 APR are inconsistent with the State's 618 data.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. Although the State provided FFY 2004 baseline data and FFY 2005 progress data, the data are inconsistent with the State's 618 reported data. On page 28 of the APR, the State reported that the original target of 70% was set using data from a national self-assessment process completed in 2001, but noted that this national data does not align with the State's actual data collected in 2005-2006 using the Annual Report of Children Served.</p> <p>The State has revised its SPP targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. On page 1 of the FFY 2005 APR, the State described its stakeholder involvement in the development, review, and revision of the State's APR. OSEP reminds the State it must ensure that the SPP as posted on its website is revised to reflect these changes.</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,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>2009.</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>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 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. For States that are sampling for preschool outcomes, a sampling plan should have been submitted and approved by OSEP with the State's SPP. It is unclear to OSEP whether the State's plan for selecting districts to collect data for this indicator meets the requirements. Please contact your OSEP State Contact for technical assistance.</p> <p>The State must submit its sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. If the State decides not to sample, but rather, gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly.</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's reported baseline data for this indicator are 26%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected, or if the State chose to gather census data, rather than sample, to inform OSEP and revise the SPP accordingly. The State reported on page 8 of its revised SPP, submitted on February 1, 2007, that the State gathered census data for this indicator, rather than sampling, and the State has revised the SPP to reflect this change.</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 for its efforts to engage the State's stakeholders in planning and implementing the activities necessary to address this indicator.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b></p>		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 8%.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, but the State did not describe how it 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 made that determination for districts identified in the FFY 2006 APR, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>Additionally, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 the State must provide a description of what the percentages listed in its SPP targets represent.</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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 14%.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided data on the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The measurement for Indicator 10 requires States to include a description of how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories 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 it made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State must also describe in its FFY 2006 APR, how the State made that determination for districts identified in the FFY 2006 APR, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>Additionally, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 the State must provide a description of what the percentages listed in its SPP targets represent.</p>



Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 did not submit baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 100% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. It appears that the State will be reporting data based on a State-established timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted. If this is not the case, please clarify in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and describe the State's timeframe within which an initial evaluation must be completed.</p> <p>The State did not submit baseline data for FFY 2005 as required, however, the State did provide a plan for collection and indicated that it would report baseline data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State must provide the FFY 2006 data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. Additionally, in the FFY 2006 APR, the State must provide a description of what the percentages listed in its SPP targets represent.</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 55%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 progress data are not valid and reliable because of State-identified concerns about the accuracy of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. The State did not submit FFY 2004 baseline data and the State indicated concerns that the FFY 2005 data for this indicator are not valid and reliable. On page 30 of the APR, the State reported that, in 2004-2005, its data system did not collect data on the number of children with an IEP developed and implemented by their 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday, but in 2005-2006 school districts were asked to collect the required data and report it to the State as part of their Consolidated Resource Plan. The State noted that it had updated its data system to allow for collection of the required information and, through further analysis of the data, it will generate reliable information to address this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not submit raw data or provide all of the information required by the measurement when reporting its FFY 2005 data for this indicator, including the range of days beyond the child's third birthday when</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays. The State reported that the number of children for whom parental refusal caused delays was 50, but it is unclear what percent of the reported data of 55% this number represents since the State did not provide raw data for this indicator. The State must provide the required data, applying the proper measurement, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>On page 30 of the FFY 2005 APR, the State indicates that the “proposed target for 2006-2007 is set at 60%,” however, the SPP, on page 50, set the targets for this indicator at 100%. OSEP reminds the State that Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator and all targets must be established at 100% compliance with the requirements.</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 did not submit baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State established its targets at 100% as required by the instructions for this indicator and provided improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 20, 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 baseline data and any other required data are reported in the FFY 2005 APR. As indicated above, the State did not provide baseline data for FFY 2005 as required, but did provide a plan for collection of the data to begin in December 2006.</p> <p>The State must provide the FFY 2006 data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and provide a description of what the percentages listed in the targets represent. 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 §300.320(b).</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be</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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>collected.</p>	<p>the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not provide its definition of post-secondary school and what constitutes full-time enrollment as required by the instructions for this indicator. The State must submit this information in 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State submitted data beyond the FFY 2005 reporting period indicating 66 of 73 findings made by the State during the 2005-2006 reporting period were corrected within one year of the State's identification of the noncompliance. The State reports the remaining 7 findings must be corrected no later than the end of March 2007 to meet the requirement for timely correction of noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100% and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance. The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. Specifically, the State had not, in its SPP, provided baseline data for the "percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.), corrected within one year of identification" (formerly Indicator 15C). The State did not recalculate its FFY 2004 baseline data to include the findings of noncompliance the State identified "through other mechanisms."</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter also required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, a description of how districts are selected for monitoring. The State did not submit the required description in the FFY 2005 APR and, although the State provided a website where the monitoring schedule can be found, OSEP was unable to find information regarding how districts are selected for monitoring. The State must provide a description of how districts are selected for monitoring in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not break down its FFY 2005 APR reported data by indicator or substantive finding areas. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements at 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. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 4A and 12 in the FFY 2006 APR, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		in this table under those indicators.
<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>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, an overview of the issue or a description of the process or system for this indicator. The State did not provide this information in its FFY 2005 APR as required. The State must provide an overview of the issue or description of the system or process in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>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 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 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, an overview of the issue or a description of the system or process for this indicator. The State did not provide this information in its FFY 2005 APR as required. The State must provide an overview of the issue or description of the system or process in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>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 in 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 baseline data for this indicator are 42%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 the State must provide a description of what the percentages listed in its SPP targets represent.</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 57%.</p>	<p>To evaluate the State's performance on this indicator, OSEP considered the State's FFY 2005 target of 57% as noted in the SPP and not the target reported on page 42 of the FFY 2005 APR ("Set by the Secretary at 100%"). The State met its 57% target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007: (1) an overview of the issue</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>or description of the system or process for this indicator; and (2) a description of what the percentages listed in the targets represent. The State did not provide this information in its FFY 2005 APR as required. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide an overview of the issue or description of the system or process and a description of what the percentages listed in the targets represent.</p> <p>In OSEP's March 20, 2006, SPP response letter, the State was advised it should review the one improvement activity stated in the SPP for this indicator to determine if additional activities are needed, or if the activity needs to be revised or modified, to have the desired effect. The State indicated in its FFY 2005 APR that it will identify, in collaboration with its stakeholders, activities, timelines, and resources to improve the State's performance on this indicator.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State acknowledged its 618 data collections were not all submitted timely and expressed concern about the accuracy of data reported for certain indicators in its FFY 2005 APR. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target that 100% of State reported data are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State acknowledged that the following 618 data collections were not submitted in a timely manner: personnel; assessment; child count; educational environment and exiting.</p> <p>The State did not submit the required data, analysis, and explanation of progress or slippage regarding the accuracy of FFY 2005 State reported data. In the FFY 2005 APR, the State indicated concerns about the accuracy of data submitted for Indicators 1 (page 5 of the APR); 2 (page 12 of the APR); 4A (page 24 of the APR), and 12 (page 30 of the APR). In addition, the State did not submit the required baseline data for Indicators 11 and 13.</p> <p>The State must provide data for Indicator 20 as a percentage in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. 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>