

Oklahoma 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 82.89%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88.26%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 89.78%.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 4.65%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 6.33%.</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>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 85.21% for reading and 85.80% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 76.10% for reading and 78.62% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 54% for reading and 42% for math.</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 against alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP following the recommendations of broad stakeholder input to align with the requirements for participation under the No Child Left Behind Act. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.18% for reading and 95.22% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 100% for reading and 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>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<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 targets for this indicator in its SPP to be more rigorous because of the implementation of the Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) in 2006 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 50.88% for reading and 53.22% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 35.04% for reading and 34.19% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 31% for reading and 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 revised the baseline and 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 2.41%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 10.19%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of 2.41%.</p> <p>The State reported no findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to recalculate its FFY 2004 baseline data for this indicator and, if appropriate; revise its targets to demonstrate progress over the new baseline; and demonstrate 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 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. OSDE provided the required information.</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).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
4. Rates of suspension and	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.	

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>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>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 hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP on the recommendation of its stakeholders, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 732 1419 1240"> <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>49.27%</td> <td>54.93%</td> <td>49.04%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>9.70%</td> <td>10.05%</td> <td>10.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.84%</td> <td>1.90%</td> <td>1.64%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and slippage for 5B and 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.27%	54.93%	49.04%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.70%	10.05%	10.24%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.84%	1.90%	1.64%	<p>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.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.27%	54.93%	49.04%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	9.70%	10.05%	10.24%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.84%	1.90%	1.64%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>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>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="548 565 1419 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 565 1060 737">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 565 1180 737">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 565 1299 737">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 565 1419 737">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 737 1060 837">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 737 1180 837">1.11%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 737 1299 837">1.24%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 737 1419 837">1.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 837 1060 1003">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 837 1180 1003">18.40%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 837 1299 1003">19.23%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 837 1419 1003">18.67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1003 1060 1140">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1003 1180 1140">34.30%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1003 1299 1140">35.13%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1003 1419 1140">27.66%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1140 1060 1276">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1140 1180 1276">25.17%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1140 1299 1276">23.37%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1140 1419 1276">23.65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1276 1060 1409">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1276 1180 1409">21.02%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1276 1299 1409">21.02%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1276 1419 1409">28.77%</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.	1.11%	1.24%	1.24%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	18.40%	19.23%	18.67%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	34.30%	35.13%	27.66%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.17%	23.37%	23.65%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	21.02%	21.02%	28.77%	<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.	1.11%	1.24%	1.24%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	18.40%	19.23%	18.67%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	34.30%	35.13%	27.66%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.17%	23.37%	23.65%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	21.02%	21.02%	28.77%																							

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 86.83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 82.11%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 84.00%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 the baseline data for this indicator in its SPP based upon its new definition of disproportionate representation and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are .56%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information demonstrating that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of all races and ethnicities in special education and related services, including, as appropriate, revising its definition of disproportionate representation. The State was also required to report on whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 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.</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 baseline data for this indicator in its SPP based upon its new definition of disproportionate representation and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the revised 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 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information demonstrating that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of all races and ethnicities in special education and related services, including, as appropriate, revising its definition of disproportionate representation. 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 baseline data for this indicator and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.45%. These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 90.62%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 46 of 46 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to either adopt OSEP's recalculation of its FFY 2005 data or provide an appropriate recalculation of the baseline data as the revised SPP baseline data for this indicator with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. OSDE accepted OSEP's recalculation of its FFY 2005 baseline 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 corrected in a timely manner.</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), including reporting correction of the</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 86.97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86.72%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to either adopt OSEP's recalculation of its FFY 2005 data in its APR, or explain why the State's calculation was appropriate. OSDE reported that it adopted OSEP's recalculation.</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 and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.53%.</p> <p>The State reported that 82 of 82 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</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 secondary transition requirements in 34</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		CFR §300.320(b).
<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 86.97%.</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 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 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.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 9, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, 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'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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one hearing. 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 requirements of 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Oklahoma 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]		
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80.00%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 85.00%.</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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.67%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 85.00%.</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>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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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 timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>