

**Nevada 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>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 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 20.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 23.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 22%.</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 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 8.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 8.0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 7.4%.</p>	<p>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, FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data. 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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 87.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 85.7%.</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; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised 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 98.6% for reading and 98.8% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.3% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.7% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 95% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]																																																																	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 513 1419 964"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>25.7%</td> <td>33.1%</td> <td>26.5</td> <td>30.5%</td> <td>34.8%</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>28.6%</td> <td>27%</td> <td></td> <td>38%</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>14.1%</td> <td>21.7%</td> <td>21.5%</td> <td>23.8%</td> <td>28.2%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>21%</td> <td></td> <td>23.2%</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td>25.6%</td> <td>18%</td> <td></td> <td>17.4%</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>16%</td> <td>17.7%</td> <td>19.5%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>17.4%</td> <td>18.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>30.1%</td> <td>36.7%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>11.6%</td> <td>15.1%</td> <td>15.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data. The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			3	25.7%	33.1%	26.5	30.5%	34.8%	34%	4		28.6%	27%		38%	32%	5	14.1%	21.7%	21.5%	23.8%	28.2%	26%	6		19.9%	21%		23.2%	25%	7		25.6%	18%		17.4%	18%	8	16%	17.7%	19.5%	15%	17.4%	18.5%	HS	30.1%	36.7%	27%	11.6%	15.1%	15.5%	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.
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	25.7%	33.1%	26.5	30.5%	34.8%	34%																																																											
4		28.6%	27%		38%	32%																																																											
5	14.1%	21.7%	21.5%	23.8%	28.2%	26%																																																											
6		19.9%	21%		23.2%	25%																																																											
7		25.6%	18%		17.4%	18%																																																											
8	16%	17.7%	19.5%	15%	17.4%	18.5%																																																											
HS	30.1%	36.7%	27%	11.6%	15.1%	15.5%																																																											
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 6%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.	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, that when it identified significant discrepancies it reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) policies, practices and procedures relating to each of the following topics: development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The State provided the required information.																																																															

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
		<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 one LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</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]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1284 1419 1516"> <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>63.8%</td> <td>58.9%</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>13.2%</td> <td>15.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63.8%	58.9%	54%	B. Removed from regular class greater	15.6%	13.2%	15.6%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target											
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63.8%	58.9%	54%											
B. Removed from regular class greater	15.6%	13.2%	15.6%											

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 233 1423 378"> <tr> <td>than 60% of the day.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">2%</td> <td align="center">1.7%</td> <td align="center">1.7%</td> </tr> </table> <p>These data represent progress in 5B and 5C and slippage in 5A from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p>				than 60% of the day.				C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2%	1.7%	1.7%													
than 60% of the day.																									
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2%	1.7%	1.7%																						
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 for the FFY 2006 APR.																								
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 943 1423 1523"> <thead> <tr> <th>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th>Social Emotional</th> <th>Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th>Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center">1.43%</td> <td align="center">1.11%</td> <td align="center">1.54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center">11.92%</td> <td align="center">14.51%</td> <td align="center">12.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center">11.92%</td> <td align="center">16.58%</td> <td align="center">8.26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center">14.67%</td> <td align="center">17.21%</td> <td align="center">13.67%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.43%	1.11%	1.54%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11.92%	14.51%	12.50%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	11.92%	16.58%	8.26%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	14.67%	17.21%	13.67%	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.
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																						
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.43%	1.11%	1.54%																						
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11.92%	14.51%	12.50%																						
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	11.92%	16.58%	8.26%																						
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	14.67%	17.21%	13.67%																						

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	60.06%	50.58%	64.04%	
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]	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP in the SPP submitted in December 2005.</p> <p>The State revised 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 68.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 71.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its target of 72%.</p>				OSEP 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 education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State provided baseline data and revised 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 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 that no districts were identified in FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 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>				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, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data 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 a description of how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State was also required to demonstrate that it makes an annual determination of whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification and describe and report on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 provided baseline data and revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP.</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 determined in FFY 2005 and 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>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, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, progress data 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 a description of how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State was also required to demonstrate that it makes an annual determination of whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification and describe and report on its review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. 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).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised 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 83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 76.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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, data regarding the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluations were completed, and for those children whose</p>

**Nevada 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>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that based on a review of all initial evaluation records during 2006-2007 to demonstrate correction, the LEA did not correct the noncompliance. The LEA had only four students referred for an initial evaluation during 2006-2007 and when one student had a delay, the compliance level was 75%. The State required the LEA to conduct training, attend mandatory technical assistance activities, and to continue to collect and report data demonstrating compliance with the initial evaluation timeline. The State reported that given the very small “n” in the district, no further activities were taken.</p>	<p>evaluations were timely completed, the number found eligible and the number found not eligible. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due in February 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 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 revised the improvement activities in its SPP for this indicator and OSEP accepts the revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81%.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 83.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that no findings of noncompliance related to this indicator were identified FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State reported that one finding of noncompliance related to this indicator identified in FFY 2004 was not corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State took several enforcement actions, including requiring the district to provide evidence of staff training, submit a district improvement grant to be funded from State set-aside funds, key administrators are required to meet with SEA staff at least quarterly and</p>	<p>The State did not report 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>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	participate in mandatory technical assistance.	data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<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 68%. These data demonstrate progress from the FFY 2005 data of 21%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State provided the district the names of the three students whose transitions services did not comply with Part B requirements and required the district to correct the noncompliance during the next annual IEP development for these students.</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 in February 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 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 62.9%.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data</p>	<p>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, data on the correction of outstanding</p>



**Nevada 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>possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 52%.</p> <p>The State reported that 111 of 128 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the four districts with uncorrected noncompliance, each district was required in its corrective action plan to develop and provide comprehensive staff training, revise policies and procedures as necessary, submit a district improvement grant to be funded from State set-aside funds, district administrators are required to meet with SEA staff at least quarterly and participate in mandatory technical assistance.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 (all in one district) remain uncorrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the district was required to provide evidence of staff training, submit a district improvement grant to be funded from State set-aside funds, key administrators are required to meet with SEA staff at least quarterly and participate in mandatory technical assistance.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. The State provided the required information.</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 FFYs 2004 and 2005.</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 timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions.</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.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions.</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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

**Nevada 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>
[Compliance Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 67%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 85%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions. The State reported that nine of nine mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported fewer than 10 mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data 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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	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).