

Massachusetts 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 targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The new targets were made more rigorous.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 62.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 baseline data of 61.7%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of 61.7%.</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 targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The new targets were made more rigorous.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 5.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 revised target of 5.6%.</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, progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 41.4% for English Language Arts and 43.6% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 25% for English Language Arts and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 19% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 45% for English Language Arts and met its FFY 2006 target of 37% for math.</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> |
| <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>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.9% for English Language Arts and 97.7% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.6% for English Language Arts and remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 97.7% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 99% for English Language Arts and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 99% for 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> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <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 and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The new targets were made more rigorous.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.7% for English Language Arts and 54% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 64.8% for English Language Arts and progress from the revised FFY 2005 data of 51.5% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 revised target of 85.4% for English Language Arts and did not meet its FFY 2006 revised target of 76.5% for 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> |
| <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. The new targets were made more rigorous.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are .29%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its definition of significant discrepancy.</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, due February 1, 2008, information that demonstrates that it has adopted and used an appropriate method of identifying significant discrepancies among LEAs; and 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: (1) for the five districts identified in FFY 2003; (2) for the six districts identified in FFY 2004; and (3) for the four districts identified in FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>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,</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---|-------|-----|-------|--|-------|-------|-------|---|------|------|------|---|
| | | the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEA identified with a significant discrepancy in FFY 2006. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <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. [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; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="716 915 1346 1474"> <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>49.1%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>43.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>15.7%</td> <td>15.3%</td> <td>16.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>6.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in 5A and 5B and remain</p> | | FFY 2005 Data | FFY 2006 Data | FFY 2006 Target | A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. | 49.1% | 53% | 43.4% | B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. | 15.7% | 15.3% | 16.2% | C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 6.7% | 6.7% | 6.8% | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| | FFY 2005 Data | FFY 2006 Data | FFY 2006 Target | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. | 49.1% | 53% | 43.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. | 15.7% | 15.3% | 16.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 6.7% | 6.7% | 6.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|----|----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|--|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|--|
| | unchanged in 5C from the FFY 2005 data. The State met its FFY 2006 revised targets. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator] | Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New] | The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="716 662 1386 1515"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="716 662 1060 837">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 662 1157 837">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1157 662 1262 837">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1262 662 1386 837">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 837 1060 938">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 837 1157 938">4%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 837 1262 938">4%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 837 1386 938">4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 938 1060 1109">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 938 1157 1109">25%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 938 1262 1109">25%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 938 1386 1109">18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 1109 1060 1243">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1109 1157 1243">33%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1109 1262 1243">32%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 1109 1386 1243">29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 1243 1060 1382">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1243 1157 1382">18%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1243 1262 1382">19%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 1243 1386 1382">17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="716 1382 1060 1515">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1382 1157 1515">20%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1382 1262 1515">20%</td> <td data-bbox="1262 1382 1386 1515">32%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | 06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data | Social Emotional | Knowledge & Skills | Appropriate Behavior | a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning. | 4% | 4% | 4% | b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 25% | 25% | 18% | c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. | 33% | 32% | 29% | d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 18% | 19% | 17% | e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 20% | 20% | 32% | The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. |
| 06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data | Social Emotional | Knowledge & Skills | Appropriate Behavior | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning. | 4% | 4% | 4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 25% | 25% | 18% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. | 33% | 32% | 29% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 18% | 19% | 17% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 20% | 20% | 32% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Massachusetts 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 76%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 76%.</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 improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.</p> | <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification and a description of how the State made that determination. The State was required to provide information to demonstrate that the State makes an annual determination of the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification and that it examines the data for both underrepresentation and overrepresentation. The State was also required to demonstrate that it makes an annual determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, and if it identifies significant disproportionality, it: 1) provides for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; 2) requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>services; and 3) requires the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). 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. [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%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> | <p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 progress data on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination. The State was required to provide information to demonstrate that the State makes an annual determination of the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification and that it examines the data for both underrepresentation and overrepresentation. The State was also required to demonstrate that it makes an annual determination of whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs with respect to identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, and if it identifies significant disproportionality, it: 1) provides for the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices; 2) requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds to be used for early intervening services; and 3) requires the LEA to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices, as required in 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 14 of 14 districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator timely corrected the noncompliance.</p> | <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation 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 requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> |
| <p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 72%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 39 of 96 districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator timely corrected the noncompliance. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the remaining 57 districts are currently completing their corrective actions and the State will continue to work with them until the corrective actions are completed.</p> | <p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on the number of children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluations and the "reasons for the delays" when eligibility was determined and the IEP was developed beyond the child's third birthday. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|--|
| | | requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR. |
| <p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 19 of 19 districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator timely corrected the noncompliance.</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 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 93%.</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, definitions of “competitive employment” and “post-secondary school”. The State provided the required information.</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 63%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 69%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 707 out of 1125 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that an additional 291 findings of noncompliance (89%) were corrected by April, 2008. The State reported that nineteen school districts have not yet corrected the 127 remaining findings of noncompliance that were identified in FFY 2005. Four districts have had</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 progress data on the correction of findings of noncompliance made through due process hearings, as well as findings of noncompliance made through complaints and data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 (2004-2005). The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>on-site visits conducted, 9 districts have on-site visits scheduled, and for the remaining 6 districts, the State reported the district specific follow-up activities it is carrying out.</p> <p>The State reported that 667 out of 813 findings (82%) of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 had been corrected by February 1, 2008. The State reported that all districts with outstanding findings of noncompliance that were identified in FFY 2004 have either received an on-site visit or are scheduled to receive one by June 2, 2008.</p> | <p>corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 and FFY 2004.</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> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p> |
| <p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81%.</p> <p>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.</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 96.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 88%.</p> <p>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 due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p> |
| <p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 6.25%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 48%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> |

Massachusetts Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 83.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 86%.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 93%. 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 and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> |