

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

While the State has publicly reported on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I), those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, Texas indicated that it will not report on Indicator B-12 until 2009. It also indicated that it will not begin to report on all indicators until 2010. Currently, TX reports only on LEA performance on Indicators B 1 through B 6.

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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 74.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 75%.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 10.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 6.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 2.9%.</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: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 87.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.1% for reading and 98.7 % for math. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95% for reading and met its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2006 target of 95% for math.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 70.8% for reading and 68.99% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 66% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 65.03% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 60% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 50% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 4.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State described the process that the State will use to review, and if appropriate, revise (or require 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 for FFY 2006. However, as of the time of the APR submission, this process had not been completed for FFY 2005 or FFY 2006, as required in the FFY 2005 response table.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR a description of 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. The State did not submit evidence that this review was completed by the time of the APR submission. This demonstrates noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</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</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
		<p>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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</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>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’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1214 1419 1490"> <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>55.99%</td> <td>58.9%</td> <td>55.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>12.61%</td> <td>12.34%</td> <td>11.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.99%	58.9%	55.6%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.61%	12.34%	11.9%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance for Indicator 5B in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target											
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.99%	58.9%	55.6%											
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.61%	12.34%	11.9%											

Texas 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]	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.27%	1.22%	1.27%	
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]	The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP. The State's data for this indicator are not valid and reliable. The measurement for this indicator required that the State provide entry data for the FFY 2005 APR and progress data for the FFY 2006 APR. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State only provided entry data for FFY 2006.				OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State did not report the required progress data. The State did provide entry level data for the 14 largest school districts and a plan to provide progress data for the FFY 2007 SPP due February 1, 2009. 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.
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	The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 69%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage,				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>because the State considered baseline data from FFY 2005 not to be valid and reliable. The State reported it will use FFY 2006 data as the baseline for this indicator.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are .16%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State did not provide separate actual target data for Indicators 9 and 10, and OSEP cannot distinguish between the two. The State did distinguish between those districts with disproportionate representation under Indicators 9 and 10, but did not make the distinction in reporting that two districts reported that their disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. In addition, the State did not examine data for FFY 2006 for the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. As a result of the lack of valid and reliable data, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. Another reason that OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage is that the State still has not determined whether the disproportionate representation it identified in the FFY 2005 SPP was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 because the State did not complete the identification process for FFY 2005.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR, data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2005 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, in addition to the data for FFY 2007, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3).</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was not corrected. In reporting on correction of this noncompliance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must distinguish which noncompliance was in LEAs identified under Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<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 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are .16%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State did not provide separate actual target data for Indicator 9 and 10, and OSEP cannot distinguish between the two. The State did distinguish between those districts with disproportionate representation under Indicator 9 and 10, but did not make the distinction in reporting that two districts reported that their disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. In addition the State did not examine data for FFY 2006 for the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. As a result of the lack of valid and reliable data, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. Another reason that OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State still has not determined whether the disproportionate representation it identified in the FFY 2005 SPP was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 because the State did not complete the identification process for FFY 2005.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2005 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, in addition to the data for FFY 2007, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was not corrected. In reporting on correction of this noncompliance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must distinguish which noncompliance was in LEAs identified under Indicator 10.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<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 did not report FFY 2006 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required baseline data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). The State did not submit the required baseline data. Thus, the State has not submitted the required baseline data for either of the last two years.</p> <p>Although the State reported last year that it would collect data on this indicator in 2006-2007, the State indicated in the FFY 2006 revision to the SPP that the data system was not completed in time for 2006-2007 collection. The State reported that it is finalizing a data collection mechanism for the required baseline data and that all districts will report a representative sample in 2007-2008. The State must provide the required baseline data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are</p>	<p>The State did not report FFY 2006 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required baseline data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124. The State did not submit the required baseline data. Thus, the State has not submitted the required baseline data for either of the last two years.</p> <p>Although the State reported last year that it would collect data on this indicator in 2006-2007, the State indicated in the FFY 2006 revision to the SPP that the data system was not completed in time for 2006-2007 collection. The State reported that it is finalizing a data collection mechanism for the required baseline data and all districts will report on a representative sample in 2007-2008. The State must provide the required baseline data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The FFY 2007 revision to the SPP for this indicator does not include improvement activities. The State must develop and implement improvement activities that 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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</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>The State provided baseline data, targets of 100% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 20%. The State is using these data to establish a baseline for this indicator. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report data in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR the required baseline data for this indicator. The required data was provided.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, 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>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 81.71%. However the baseline data and targets are based upon limited data that were not collected in a manner consistent with the OSEP-approved sampling plan. As a result, the data are not valid or reliable.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR a narrative that defines competitive employment and postsecondary school as required by the instructions for the FFY 2005 SPP/APR. The State provided the required narrative.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required 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 revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 94.6%</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the noncompliance from FFY 2005 that had not been corrected within one year of its identification, the State described a graduated series of intervention actions, ranging from the assignment of a Special Purpose Conservator or Special Purpose Monitor to monthly staff follow-up by e-mail and phone to verify correction of noncompliance issues with associated numbers of findings and districts.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State in the February 1, 2008 APR to report on continuing follow-up on seven uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State reported that four of the seven have been corrected. The State further reported that additional sanctions have been imposed on the three districts responsible for the three remaining uncorrected findings.</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 2004 and FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 (2006-2007) 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 4 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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding 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 revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those 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 regarding compliance with 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 revised its baseline and targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The targets were revised to reflect a new understanding of the definition of Settlement Agreement, for the purposes of this agreement.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 20.4%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State used a revised definition of Settlement Agreement and the</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>calculations for 2005-06 and 2006-07 are not measuring the same data set. OSEP cannot determine if the State made its target, because it revised its baseline and provided targets starting with FFY 2007.</p>	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 73.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 79.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 73.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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 82.9%. 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 February 1, 2008 APR, data for Indicators 7, 11, 12, and 13, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). The State provided data for Indicator 13, but not for Indicators 7, 11 and 12. In addition, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for Indicators 9, 10 and 14. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. 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 timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>