

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 58.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 57.5%</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 72%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 6.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 6.0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 5.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 26.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 10%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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;</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.1% for reading and 96.9% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 41.1% for reading and 34.9% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 39.1% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 48.9% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 50% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 49% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 19.29%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.5% (a decrease of 2%).</p> <p>The State provided information on the completion of the review 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 IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for four out of the seven LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005 and for 8 of the 38 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR the use of a proper method for identifying significant discrepancies, both in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State satisfied this requirement.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, 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 the 3 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and for the 30 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006 for which the State did not report on in the FFY 2006 APR, as</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).  OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																
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]	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																	
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 60% of the day; or  C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.  [Results Indicator]	The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 963 1417 1341"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>70.6%</td> <td>68.9%</td> <td>72.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>11.3%</td> <td>11.0%</td> <td>10.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="548 1360 1417 1425">These data represent slippage in part A and progress in parts B and C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1442 1417 1507">The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target for parts A and B and met its FFY 2006 target for part C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.6%	68.9%	72.5%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.3%	11.0%	10.1%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.2%	1.9%	2.3%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	70.6%	68.9%	72.5%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.3%	11.0%	10.1%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.2%	1.9%	2.3%															

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<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>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</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>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 634 1419 1317"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 634 1062 805">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 634 1182 805">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 634 1302 805">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 634 1419 805">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 805 1062 873">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 805 1182 873">6.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 805 1302 873">3.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 805 1419 873">3.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 873 1062 1008">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 873 1182 1008">22.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 873 1302 1008">24.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 873 1419 1008">24.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1008 1062 1110">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1008 1182 1110">22.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1008 1302 1110">30.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1008 1419 1110">13.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1110 1062 1213">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1110 1182 1213">30.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1110 1302 1213">22.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1110 1419 1213">24.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1213 1062 1317">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1213 1182 1317">18.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1213 1302 1317">18.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1213 1419 1317">34.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	6.0%	3.2%	3.2%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	22.1%	24.9%	24.1%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22.9%	30.1%	13.7%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.1%	22.9%	24.1%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18.9%	18.9%	34.9%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	6.0%	3.2%	3.2%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	22.1%	24.9%	24.1%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22.9%	30.1%	13.7%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.1%	22.9%	24.1%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18.9%	18.9%	34.9%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 41% for Part B</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's</p>																								

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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]</p>	<p>619. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 44% for Part B 619.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 30% for Part B school-aged. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 25% for Part B school-aged.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 44% for Part B 619.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 25% for Part B school-aged.</p>	<p>data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR information on annual determinations of whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification is occurring in districts in the State, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), and describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices, and procedures, etc.). The State was also required to provide baseline data from FFY 2005 and data from FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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]</p>	<p>The State revised the definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR baseline data from FFY 2005 and data from FFY 2006 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 must describe how the State</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.).</p> <p>The State was also required to provide data demonstrating that, at a minimum, it examined data for the six disability categories included in the instructions for this indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The FFY 2005 reported data are 95.5%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 115 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it assigned State staff to work with the districts and programs to address the noncompliance in addition to requiring improvement plans from some of the districts.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92%.</p> <p>The FFY 2005 data for this indicator are 91%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 24 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and four additional findings were corrected by July 2007. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it assigned State staff to work with districts to correct the remaining noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 69.9%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.72%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 2437 of 2982 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 were timely corrected and that an additional 352 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 were corrected by February 1, 2008. For the uncorrected noncompliance the State reported that State staff was appointed to districts to follow up and correct the noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13, the State must 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in the previous reporting periods.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 28.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 86.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>



**Oregon Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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 revised the language of the targets and the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>