

New Mexico 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 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 52.1%.</p> <p>These data are not valid or reliable because they do not reflect the measurement for this indicator due to missing data from seven districts. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that this problem has been addressed and will not recur for the FFY 2007 data collection.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.90%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 0.69%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0.68%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP. The State provided the required information. 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 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 7.1% for both reading and math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 3% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 8% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 15% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 20% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP. 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>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 99.8% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP.</p>

New Mexico 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. 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>and 99.8% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98% for both reading and math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 95.2% for math.</p>	<p>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>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 18% for reading and 12.1% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 17% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 10% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 24% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 17% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP. The State provided the required information. 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 its definition and calculation methodology for identifying significant discrepancy, thereby establishing the revised FFY 2006 data of 2.2% as the new baseline and revising targets for this indicator for the remaining years (through 2010) on the revised baseline. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State also reported the FFY 2006 data using the previous definition. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 5.6%. The State met its previously established target of 6.2%.</p> <p>The State reported that “all five of the LEAs identified as non-compliant in FFY 2005 have corrected the non-compliance.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</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 safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs</p>

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		identified with significant discrepancies in 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 baseline and targets for part C only for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State had incorrectly measured this component of the indicator by including students who were parentally placed in private schools. The State recalculated baseline and FFY 2005 data according to the correct measure.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 979 1419 1357"> <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>49.72%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>19.26%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>18.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.58%</td> <td>2.02%</td> <td>2.01%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in parts A and B, and slippage in part C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.72%	51%	54%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	19.26%	19%	18.5%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.58%	2.02%	2.01%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the corresponding revisions to its SPP and clarification on whether students parentally placed in private schools was included in the calculations of baseline and targets. 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>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.72%	51%	54%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	19.26%	19%	18.5%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.58%	2.02%	2.01%															

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<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" data-bbox="548 667 1419 1349"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 667 1062 841">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 667 1182 841">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 667 1299 841">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 667 1419 841">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 841 1062 911">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 841 1182 911">5%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 841 1299 911">5.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 841 1419 911">4.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 911 1062 1045">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 911 1182 1045">21.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 911 1299 1045">25.1%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 911 1419 1045">21.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1045 1062 1146">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1045 1182 1146">22%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1045 1299 1146">23.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1045 1419 1146">20.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1146 1062 1247">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1146 1182 1247">26%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1146 1299 1247">25.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1146 1419 1247">24.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1247 1062 1349">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1247 1182 1349">24.3%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1247 1299 1349">20%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1247 1419 1349">28%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	5%	5.4%	4.3%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	21.7%	25.1%	21.2%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22%	23.2%	20.8%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26%	25.5%	24.9%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	24.3%	20%	28%	<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.	5%	5.4%	4.3%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	21.7%	25.1%	21.2%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22%	23.2%	20.8%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26%	25.5%	24.9%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	24.3%	20%	28%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>																								

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 89.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 86.5%.</p>	<p>improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline data for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised its definition and methodology for identifying disproportionate representation.</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 determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to 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.). 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 baseline data for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.6%. This represents progress over the revised FFY 2005 data of 10.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of nine 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</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 data from FFY 2006 of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, including a description of how the State made that determination. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements</p>

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>300.301 through 300.311. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it is addressing the noncompliance through a corrective action plan for one district and the other district is addressing the noncompliance through the “Educational Plan for Student Success” (EPSS).</p>	<p>of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 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, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 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.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 37.1%.</p> <p>These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported inconsistencies in their data collection, including missing and incomplete data. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported the problem has been addressed and revised improvement activities to ensure validation of data.</p> <p>The State reported that neither of the two districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 ensured correction in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that both districts were assigned determinations of “Needs Intervention” and both districts are addressing the noncompliance through an EPSS and are being monitored by Special Education Bureau staff.</p>	<p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. The State reported that Education Administrators were assigned to validate the data in addition to revising improvement activities to ensure validity and reliability of data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was not 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</p>

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 97.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 94.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 20 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the districts were assigned the determination of “Needs Substantial Intervention” and “Needs Intervention” and were required to participate in the Leadership Development Project (LDP) and to submit an EPSS. They will also be monitored by Special Education Bureau staff.</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 on whether the previous noncompliance had been corrected in a timely manner. 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>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>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 62.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 16 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were 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 the actual numbers as well as the percentile score and explain how it came to a single percent. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance</p>

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		<p>identified in FFY 2005 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 87.5%.</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 revised the FFY 2004 baseline data in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.4%. This represents progress over the State’s FFY 2005 data of 69%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that there were four districts in respective determinations and that Special Education Bureau staff is monitoring these districts. One district with findings in two areas was given the determination “Needs Substantial Intervention,” and is addressing its areas of noncompliance through a corrective action plan. Two districts were placed in “Needs Intervention”; were mandated to participate in the LDP or another research-based leadership program approved by the Public Education Department; are involved in the State Professional Development Grant; and are addressing corrections through</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 status of correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004; the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings from FFY 2005, by indicator; and, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, to specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 under those indicators. 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>

New Mexico 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 EPSS. One district was placed in “Needs Assistance” and is reportedly addressing the noncompliance through its EPSS. The State also reported that one LEA with six findings of noncompliance in the area of least restrictive environment did not complete its CAP and that a new and revised CAP was put in place that included the previous areas of noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that all but one district with noncompliance findings from FFY 2004 had corrected the noncompliance and that it assigned that one district the determination of “Needs Substantial Intervention,” placed it on a corrective action plan designed by the State, assigned it a technical assistance team through the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, and that the State director and another staff member have been assigned to work with the district.</p>	<p>corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 and FFY 2004. 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 10, 11, and 12 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on nine hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution</p>	<p>The State reported that two of four resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions in FFY 2006. The</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

New Mexico Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were conducted.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 63%. The State had fewer than ten requests for mediations in FFY 2005.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [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 95%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	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).