

Kentucky 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. [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 65.15%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 63.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 66.7%.</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 improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 5.00%. The State did not meet FFY 2006 target of 4.60%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>State reported no data for Indicator 3A.</p>	<p>The State did not submit the data and the State must provide the required data 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 assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.57%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 91%. 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>

Kentucky 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>State did not report data for this indicator.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions:</u></p> <p>The State did not submit a progress report that described the status of compliance demonstrating that the State is reporting to the public on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on alternate assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children as required by the Special Conditions attached to the State’s July 2, 2007 Part B grant award letter.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table indicated that the Special Conditions attached to the State’s July 3, 2006 Part B grant award letter required the State to demonstrate that: (1) it has developed and implemented guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments in all areas for all grades assessed, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(C); (2) has administered alternate assessments for students who cannot take the regular assessments in all areas for all grades assessed; and (3) is reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the participation and performance of children with disabilities in all alternate assessments in all areas for all grades assessed, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D). As OSEP set out in its November 20, 2006 letter, Kentucky’s September 1, 2006 letter reported that it had addressed the first two conditions but the State indicated that it could not report publicly and to the Secretary on the participation and performance of children with disabilities in all alternate assessments in all areas for all grades assessed, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D) until August 2007. The State submitted information in the FFY 2006 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 4.02%.</p> <p>These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that it was</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. However, the State did not revise the FFY 2004 baseline in the SPP using the revised</p>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>not confident about the validity of the data due to the fluctuations in the discipline data for nondisabled students. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State reported that although it began its special education regulations in February 2005, they were not finalized until December 2007. The State also reported that it did not review “the “old” district policies and procedures that were in effect during FFY 2005 and 2006 since they were developed prior to the 2004 IDEA,” and that its districts postponed their revision of special education policies and procedures due to delays in Kentucky’s regulations.</p> <p>Therefore, the State did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required 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 2005.</p>	<p>measurement. The State must either provide the revised FFY 2004 baseline data using the revised measurement or maintain the FFY 2004 baseline data using the old measurement. The State must indicate its choice, and if appropriate, provide the revised data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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, the description of how the State reviewed and if appropriate revised, 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 that data and the State must provide the required data, measurement, and explanation 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, 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</p>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.																
<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 hospital placements.</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 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 932 1432 1312"> <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>64.3%</td> <td>66.83%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>11.7%</td> <td>10.25%</td> <td>11.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.21%</td> <td>2.24%</td> <td>2.21%</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 FFY 2006 target for 5C.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	64.3%	66.83%	63%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.7%	10.25%	11.5%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.21%	2.24%	2.21%	<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, separate specific targets for 2006-2007, 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 as part of its revised SPP. The State has provided the required data and OSEP accepts the data submitted.</p> <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.	64.3%	66.83%	63%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.7%	10.25%	11.5%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.21%	2.24%	2.21%															

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	response table related to separate specific targets for 2006-2007, 2008-2009 and 2010-2011 as part of its revised SPP.																									
<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>	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																									
<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="548 846 1419 1520"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 846 1062 1019">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 846 1182 1019">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 846 1302 1019">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 846 1419 1019">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 1062 1084">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1019 1182 1084">19.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1019 1302 1084">43.3%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1019 1419 1084">43.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1084 1062 1222">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1084 1182 1222">4.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1084 1302 1222">7.3%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1084 1419 1222">4.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1222 1062 1325">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1222 1182 1325">12%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1222 1302 1325">12.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1222 1419 1325">7.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1325 1062 1427">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1325 1182 1427">30.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1325 1302 1427">30.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1325 1419 1427">29.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1427 1062 1520">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1427 1182 1520">34%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1427 1302 1520">5.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1302 1427 1419 1520">15.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	19.4%	43.3%	43.2%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.4%	7.3%	4.3%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12%	12.6%	7.3%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.2%	30.9%	29.7%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	34%	5.9%	15.5%	<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.	19.4%	43.3%	43.2%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.4%	7.3%	4.3%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12%	12.6%	7.3%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.2%	30.9%	29.7%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	34%	5.9%	15.5%																							

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established its baseline and targets and 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 29%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 28%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 28.5%.</p>	<p>The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it does yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established the baseline and revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions for improvement activities but cannot accept the revised baseline because the State’s description does not appear to be a reasonable method for determining inappropriate identification. The State reported that to determine inappropriate identification in districts identified with disproportionate representation in FFY 2005, it “reviewed the existing policies and procedures of the 6 identified districts.” However, the State also referenced the discussion in Indicator 4A, that the district policies and procedures that were in effect during FFY 2005 and 2006 were developed prior to the 2004 IDEA, and that its districts postponed their revision of special education policies and procedures due to delays in Kentucky’s regulations, which were not enacted until December 2007. The State also reported that new policies and procedures will be submitted by districts for State approval. Therefore, it appears that the State’s method of identifying inappropriate identification was to review district policies and procedures that were outdated. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State submitted incomplete data. The State did not report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services, but did not determine if disproportionate representation 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 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 describe how the State made that determination (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.) and provide data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 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, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007. While the State described its process to determine if disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate</p>

Kentucky 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 addition, the State reported that one district identified with underrepresentation for FFY 2006 “is relatively small in size; thus no statewide patterns of under-identification are noted at this time.” Therefore, it appears that the State does not include all LEAs with disproportionate underrepresentation in its review for inappropriate identification consistent with this measurement.</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 appears not to have used a reasonable method to determine inappropriate identification and also reported that the two districts so identified were given notice of their noncompliant status in July 2007 and that each district has one calendar year to correct the noncompliance.</p>	<p>identification, the State did not submit the baseline data from FFY 2005 or the compliance data for FFY 2006 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. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR due on February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In addressing underrepresentation, the State reported that two factors need to be present for two consecutive years before underrepresentation could be determined. The State must make an annual determination whether disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic group in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established the baseline and revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions for improvement activities but cannot accept the revised baseline because the State’s description does not appear to be a reasonable method for determining inappropriate identification. The State reported that to determine inappropriate identification in districts identified with disproportionate representation in FFY 2005, it “reviewed existing policies and procedures of the 26 districts.” However, the State also referenced the discussion in Indicator 4A, that the district policies and procedures that were in effect during FFY 2005 and 2006 were developed prior to the 2004 IDEA, and that its districts postponed their revision of special education policies and procedures due to delays in Kentucky’s regulations, which were not enacted until December 2007. The State also reported that new policies and procedures will be submitted by districts for State approval. Therefore, it appears that the State’s method of identifying inappropriate identification was to review district policies and procedures that were outdated.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage</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 APR 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 describe how the State made that determination. The State must also provide data on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 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>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>because the State provided incomplete data.</p> <p>The State did not report 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 identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but did not determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. In addition, the State reported that two districts were identified with underrepresentation for FFY 2006. However, the State also stated that “under- representation does not appear to be a significant issue in Kentucky at the present time.” Therefore, it appears that the State does not include all LEAs with disproportionate under-representation in its review for inappropriate identification consistent with this measurement.</p> <p>The State did report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that 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 appears not to have used a reasonable method to determine inappropriate identification and also the State reported that the 18 districts so identified were given notice of their noncompliant status in July 2007 and that each district has one calendar year to correct the noncompliance.</p>	<p>even if that determination occurs in the Fall of 2007.</p> <p>While the State described its process to determine if disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification, the State did not submit the baseline data from FFY 2005 or the compliance data for FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due on February 1, 2009.</p> <p>If the State determines that LEAs identified in FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 had disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are not in compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94.48%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 95.43%.</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, information demonstrating correction of the</p>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if the State timely corrected prior findings of noncompliance related to this indicator (identified in FFY 2005) because letters to the districts citing noncompliance were issued early in FFY 2006 and those districts were still within the one-year timeframe for correction.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the 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 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.</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 96.56%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 93.75%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 67% of findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year and for the remaining findings of noncompliance the State reported that school districts are requested to become members of the Part C District Early Intervention Councils (DEICs) to increase communication and problem-solve transition issues. The State reported that corrective actions “include participation in transition training.” OSEP could not determine if the noncompliant districts became members or were required to participate in such training.</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, disaggregated data consistent with the measurement as instructed and as required for this indicator. The State has provided the required data and OSEP accepts the data submitted.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance</p>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</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 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 established new 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 67.60%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State reported that the FFY 2005 baseline data was not valid and reliable as it did not represent “data on all needed items to determine compliance with Indicator 13.”</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</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</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>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State</p>

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps						
<p>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's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 282 1444 472"> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td align="center">50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">21%</td> </tr> </table>	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	50%	Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	3%	Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	21%	<p>to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, technically sound sampling plan for this indicator.</p> <p>The State submitted the revised sampling plan for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it does yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	50%							
Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	3%							
Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	21%							
<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 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 64.92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 84.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 174 of 268 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not report on any program-specific follow-up activities related to the uncorrected noncompliance.</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, disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State did not submit the status of all noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. The State reported that FFY 2006 is the first year for which the State had data for the correction of noncompliance within one year of identification.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State 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>						

Kentucky Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]	The State 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%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]	The State 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 33%. These data are based on three hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	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 §300.515, including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 70%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results 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 75%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 61%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
20. State reported data (618 and	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However,	The State must review its improvement

Kentucky 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 Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP’s calculation of the data for this indicator is 91.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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>