Monitoring Priorities and Indicators		Statı	us of APR	Data/SPP	Revision 1	[ssues		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.  [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.42%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 69.87% (also reported in the FFY 2006 APR).  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 74%.						OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to report graduation rates for the class of 2006 (FFY 2005) in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008). The State provided the required information for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.	
[Results Indicator]								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.
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.  [Results Indicator]	data represent the FFY 200	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.51%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 5.2% (also reported in the FFY 2006 APR).  The State met its FFY 2006 target of 7.4%.						OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to report dropout rates for FFY 2005 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State provided the required information for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
3. Participation and performance	The State's	FFY 2006	reported d	lata for this	indicator	are:		OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to
of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:  A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting	Grade FFY FFY FFY FFY FFY FFY FFY Service Data Data Target Data Data Target Math						improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.	
the State's AYP objectives for	Elementary							
progress for disability subgroup.  [Results Indicator]	Middle 75% 31.25% 42% 93.4% 25% 33%							
[Results indicator]	High 55.5% 44.4% 57% 66.7% 44.4% 43%							
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data.  The State met its FFY 2006 target for elementary reading and math and high school math, but did not meet its other targets.							

Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
The State revised the targets for this indicator to address additional grades for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the FFY 2005 response table. Stakeholders were involved in this process.							OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, targets addressing grades four, six and
Grade Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	seven. The State provided the required information.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to
3	99.2%	98.8%	98.9%	99.5%	98.9%	98.9%	the State demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
5	97.8%	99.2%	99.2%	99.2%	99.9%	99.2%	
7	98.5%	97.8%	97 3%	97.9%	98.6%	97.3%	
HS	95.6%	99.5%	95.5%	95.5%	99.5%	95.5%	
for FFY 20 Stakeholde	07 through rs were inv	2010 as revolved in th	equired in the squired in the squire	he FFY 20	005 respons		OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide baseline data for grade seven for reading and to provide targets addressing grades four, six and seven in the FFY 2006 APR,
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	due February 1, 2008. The State provided the required information.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to
		Reading		Math			improve performance and looks forward to the State demonstrating improvement in
3	60.60%	56.75%	68%	49.50%	51.06%	57%	performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due
							February 1, 2009.
			60%			52%	
	for FFY 20 Stakeholde The State's Grade  3 4 5 6 7 8 HS The State in The State in for FFY 20 Stakeholde The State's Grade	The State revised the for FFY 2007 through Stakeholders were inverted that a state is FFY 2006    FFY 2005	The State revised the targets for the Stakeholders were involved in the State's FFY 2006 reported depends on the State revised the targets for the State's FFY 2006 reported depends on the State's FFY 200	The State revised the targets for this indicate for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the Stakeholders were involved in this process. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this Data   FFY   FFY   FFY   2006   Data   Data   Target   Reading   3   99.2%   98.8%   98.9%   4   98.3%   98.5%   5   97.8%   99.2%   99.2%   6   98%   99.1%   7   98.5%   97.8%   8   96.2%   98.2%   97.3%   HS   95.6%   99.5%   95.5%   The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets. The State revised the targets for this indicate for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the Stakeholders were involved in this process. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this PFY 2005   2006   Data   Data   Target   Reading   3   60.60%   56.75%   68%   4   50.60%   52.56%   5   55.50%   55.13%   60%   6   39.70%   40.74%   60%   60%   6   39.70%   40.74%   60%   6	The State revised the targets for this indicator to address for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the FFY 2008 takeholders were involved in this process.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator    FFY	The State revised the targets for this indicator to address addition for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the FFY 2005 responsible Stakeholders were involved in this process.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:    FFY	The State revised the targets for this indicator to address additional grades for FFY 2007 through 2010 as required in the FFY 2005 response table. Stakeholders were involved in this process.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:    FFY

Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
8	41.10%	42.12%	42%	27.30%	26.46%	27%	
HS	26%	29.80%	30%	23.10%	24.08%	24%	
2005 data.				ippage in p	oart from t	he FFY	
data repres	ent slippag	e from the	FFY 2005	data of 21		. These	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to clarify in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, whether districts identified in the FFY 2005 SPP/APR as having a significant
							discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year were the same or different from those districts
							identified from the previous year. The State provided the required clarification.
							In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified based on FFY 2006 data. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 data whose policies and procedures were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and that were also identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data, the review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply
	HS These data 2005 data. The State r The State's data repres	8 41.10% HS 26% These data represent p 2005 data. The State met part of The State's FFY 2006 data represent slippag	8 41.10% 42.12% HS 26% 29.80% These data represent progress in 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 200 The State's FFY 2006 reported data represent slippage from the	8 41.10% 42.12% 42% HS 26% 29.80% 30%  These data represent progress in part and sl. 2005 data.  The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this data represent slippage from the FFY 2005	8 41.10% 42.12% 42% 27.30% HS 26% 29.80% 30% 23.10% These data represent progress in part and slippage in part 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator	8 41.10% 42.12% 42% 27.30% 26.46% HS 26% 29.80% 30% 23.10% 24.08%  These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the 2005 data.  The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 31.6% data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 21.1%.	8 41.10% 42.12% 42% 27.30% 26.46% 27% HS 26% 29.80% 30% 23.10% 24.08% 24%  These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data.  The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.  The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 31.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 21.1%.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP	Revision 1	Issues		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
					with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; and whether practices in these areas continue to comply with applicable requirements.
					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).
					OSEP appreciate the State's efforts to improve performance.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required	for the FI	FY 2006 A	PR.	
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]					
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this	indicator	are:		OSEP's February 27, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter indicated that the State's
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	funding formula continues to be a barrier toward ensuring the appropriate placement of children in the least restrictive
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.75%	51.33%	53.0%	environment. On June 1, 2006, the State submitted an assurance that the funding
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	20.16%	19.03%	19.7%	mechanism will be revised as of June 30, 2006 through the inclusion, in Delaware's

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP	Revision 1	Issues		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps		
placements, or homebound or hospital placements.  [Results Indicator]	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.92%	6.19%	4.5%	holds the force of law) of language that authorizes the development of a plan to expand the needs based funding structure to		
[Results indicator]	However, the State's FFY 2006 data under 5.39%.  These data represent progress in 5A and 5B FFY 2005 data.  The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5A a target for 5C.	and slippa	age in 5C f	From the	include all districts and charter schools by September 2008. As indicated in Delaware's FFY 2006 grant award letter, OSEP expects that the State will fully implement the needs based funding structure by September 2008.  OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.		
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).  [Results Indicator]	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required f	or the FFY	7 2006 AP	R.			
7. Percent of preschool children	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress date	ta for this i	indicator a	re:	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR		
with IEPs who demonstrate improved:  A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);  B. Acquisition and use of	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	response table required the State to submit progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY		
knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	30%	4%	4%	2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008		
early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.    Improve functioning.					APR, due February 1, 2010.		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP	Revision 1	Issues		OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator; New]	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	43%	49%	28%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30%	29%	37%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	18%	10%	24%	
	The State provided improvement activities remaining years of the SPP.	for this inc	dicator cov	ering the	
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.  [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline dat The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target	OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit FFY 2005 baseline data. The State reported that it did not collect the data for FFY 2005 and provided FFY 2006 baseline.  OSEP appreciates the State's effort to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.			
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data  The State met its FFY 2006 terrest of 0%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.			
education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.  The State reported the actual number of dishave disproportionate representation of racieducation and related services that was the identification.				
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.			
	The State reported the actual number of dis				

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.	
11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 91%. OSEP could not determine whether these data represent progress or slippage because the State did not submit FFY 2005 data.  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	The State must ensure that its reporting in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, includes information about the reasons for delays in evaluations.  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 is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81.6%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.  In Indicator 15, the State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide, in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed as required in the instructions for this indicator. The State provided the required information.
		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.
		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 is in compliance with the requirements in 34

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
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]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 74.3%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.  In Indicator 15, the State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a time manner.	identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.
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.  [Results Indicator; New]	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.  The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are:  Percent of youth who are competitively employed.  Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.  Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
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]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.  The State met its target of 100%.	data OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §\$300.149 and 300.600 and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that continue to demonstrate compliance with these requirements. In addition, in responding to

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from OSEP's FFY 2005 calculation of 20%.  The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on four due process hearings and represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 33%.  The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.  [Results Indicator]	The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
<ul><li>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</li><li>[Results Indicator]</li></ul>	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 86%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 64%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 88%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%.	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 timely and accurate data requirements in

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §\$76.720 and 300.601(b).