

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported FFY 2006 data for this indicator of 69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 68%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 67%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR clarification of whether students who graduate with an IEP diploma are included in its calculation for this indicator and revise the baseline to reflect FFY 2004 data. The State provided all information required from the FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported FFY 2006 data for this indicator of 7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 6.7%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 6.25%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR separate targets and report separately on Indicators 1 and 2. The State provided the required information.</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 revised the baseline, targets, and 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 7.4%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its AYP calculation from one based on three specific grades to a proficiency index for multiple-grade bands.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of 7.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to revise its baseline data from FFY 2004 to reflect district performance for the disability subgroup in reading and math across all grades assessed in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State provided all information required from the FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table.</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</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 100%. These</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																									
<p>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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 95.76%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</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 baseline, targets, and 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:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="583 613 1207 902"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Reading</td> <td colspan="2">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3-5</td> <td>37.29%</td> <td>64.2%</td> <td>31.14%</td> <td>47.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-8</td> <td>22.24%</td> <td>47.6%</td> <td>14.20%</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>37.46%</td> <td>61.5%</td> <td>13.89%</td> <td>43.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its data calculation and moved from single grade analysis to analysis of multiple-grade bands.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading		Math		3-5	37.29%	64.2%	31.14%	47.3%	6-8	22.24%	47.6%	14.20%	38%	10	37.46%	61.5%	13.89%	43.6%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																							
	Reading		Math																								
3-5	37.29%	64.2%	31.14%	47.3%																							
6-8	22.24%	47.6%	14.20%	38%																							
10	37.46%	61.5%	13.89%	43.6%																							
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 14%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 21%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 based on one of the comparisons specified in 34 CFR §300.170(a). The State provided this information. However, while the State described how the review of policies, procedures and practices would be conducted, the State did not report on the review of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and</p>																									

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
		<p>implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards for the districts that were identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005.</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>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 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>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</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: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</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="583 1484 1455 1523"> <tr> <td data-bbox="583 1484 1094 1523"></td> <td data-bbox="1094 1484 1213 1523">FFY</td> <td data-bbox="1213 1484 1333 1523">FFY</td> <td data-bbox="1333 1484 1455 1523">FFY</td> </tr> </table>		FFY	FFY	FFY	<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	FFY	FFY			

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<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>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="569 196 1094 277"></th> <th data-bbox="1094 196 1213 277">2005 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1213 196 1333 277">2006 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1333 196 1465 277">2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 277 1094 358">A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1094 277 1213 358">49%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1213 277 1333 358">50.11%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1333 277 1465 358">49.35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 358 1094 440">B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1094 358 1213 440">14.11%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1213 358 1333 440">13.46%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1333 358 1465 440">14.56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 440 1094 537">C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1094 440 1213 537">1.09%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1213 440 1333 537">1.89%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1333 440 1465 537">1.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>				2005 Data	2006 Data	2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49%	50.11%	49.35%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.11%	13.46%	14.56%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.09%	1.89%	1.0%	
	2005 Data	2006 Data	2006 Target																	
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49%	50.11%	49.35%																	
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14.11%	13.46%	14.56%																	
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.09%	1.89%	1.0%																	
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																			
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="569 1122 1094 1300">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1094 1122 1213 1300">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1213 1122 1333 1300">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1333 1122 1465 1300">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1300 1094 1365">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1094 1300 1213 1365">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1213 1300 1333 1365">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1333 1300 1465 1365">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1365 1094 1502">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1094 1365 1213 1502">8%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1213 1365 1333 1502">18%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1333 1365 1465 1502">18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0%	0%	3%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	8%	18%	18%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data and improvement activities. 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.	0%	0%	3%																	
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	8%	18%	18%																	

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	47%	39%	26%	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	37%	21%	18%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8%	21%	34%	
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.</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 24%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 24%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 24%.</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR a copy of the survey the State is using to collect data for this indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0% (also provided in the FFY 2006 APR).</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 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services 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, a separate report rather than a combined report with Indicator 10; a definition of disproportionate representation; baseline data from FFY 2005 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 that determination was made. The State was also required to provide data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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. Additionally, the State was required to provide data and information that demonstrated that the districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.210 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the 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% (also provided in the FFY 2006 APR).</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 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that the one LEA identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</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, a separate report rather than a combined report with Indicator 9. The State was also required to provide its definition of disproportionate representation; baseline data from FFY 2005 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; a description of how the State made that determination; data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification; and a description of how the</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State made that determination. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected.</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 reestablished the baseline 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 87.4%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the FFY 2006 data are based on a new data collection methodology.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</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 2006 data that reflect all required measurements for this indicator. The State was also required to provide the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reason for the delay. The State provided the required information.</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 requirement 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</p>	<p>The State reestablished the baseline and revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 reported data for FFY 2006 are 71%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because FFY 2006 data are based on a new data collection methodology.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the prior database was unable to provide valid data for all components of the measurement and that no monitoring findings had been made in this area. Therefore, OSEP could not determine that the State timely corrected prior noncompliance related to this indicator.</p>	<p>in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the reasons for the delays, and must report data for all required measurements for Indicator 12. The State provided the required information.</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 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 33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 15%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the 170 of 170 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 the FFY 2005 APR with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) 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 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 84%.</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</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%. However, the FFY 2005 data were not valid and reliable, and the FFY 2006 data are valid and reliable.</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</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>§§300.149 and 300.600.</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 in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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 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 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%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with timely due process hearing 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 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 19.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 25%.</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. [Results 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%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 98.3. 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>