

Connecticut Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE		
<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 did not report FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported FFY 2004 revised baseline data of 68%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 68%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In its SPP, the State initially reported FFY 2004 data comparing youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma as compared to all youth graduating with a regular diploma, but reported that these data were not available for reporting in its FFY 2005 APR. The State reported that it has implemented improvement activities to enable timely reporting in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data from FFY 2005 as well as data from FFY 2006 in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, in accordance with OSEP’s instructions for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2006 APR submission.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 did not report FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported revised FFY 2004 baseline data of 5.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 5.5%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State initially reported data in its SPP comparing dropout rates for youth with IEPs as compared with dropout rates for all youth, but indicated that these data were not available for reporting in the FFY 2005 APR submission. The State reported that it had implemented improvement activities to enable timely reporting of required data in the FFY 2006 APR submission.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data from FFY 2005 as well as FFY 2006 data in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008 in accordance with OSEP’s instructions for Indicator 2. OSEP looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, demonstrating improvement in performance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2005 reported data for Indicator 3A are 35.8%. The State met its FFY 2005 revised target of 35.0%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for Indicator 3A in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State met its revised target, and OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 3B are 98.3% for reading in grades 4, 6 and 8 and 98.7% for math in grades 4, 6 and 8. The State’s FFY 2005 reported data are 95.1% for 10th grade reading and 94.5% for 10th grade math. The State met its FFY 2005 targets of 95% for reading in all grades assessed, and its FFY 2005 targets of 95% for math for grades 4, 6 and 8, but did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95% for math for grade 10.</p> <p>The State did not use all required measurements in reporting on this indicator.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the State met its revised targets, except for grade 10 math, the State did not use all required measurements for this indicator as required by OSEP’s instructions for the FFY 2005 APR submission. The State reported that it could not separate the data on children with IEPs who take regular assessments with and without accommodations because the assessment files and the accommodations files are not integrated.</p> <p>OSEP’s February 9, 2007 letter providing the State the results of OSEP’s verification visit required the State, by June 1, 2007, CSDE to submit documentation that the State is meeting the requirement, at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D)(i), to report to the public the number of children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate in regular assessments, with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports assessment results for children without disabilities. By letter of June 1, 2007, the State informed OSEP that it is reporting publicly for the 2006-2007 school year on the number of children with IEPs who take regular assessments with accommodations, and will continue to do so. OSEP confirmed that this information is posted on a website that provides the results of the Connecticut Mastery Test. As a result of this action, OSEP anticipates that the State will be able to report data reflecting the number of children with IEPs who take regular assessments with accommodations in the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance for Indicator 3B. OSEP looks forward to the State’s data reflecting all required</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		measurements for Indicator 3B and demonstrating improvement in performance for participation of children with IEPs in grade 10 math in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<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's FFY 2005 reported data for Indicator 3C are 29.3% for reading and 38.6% for math in grades 4, 6, and 8. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 68% for reading and 74% for math in grades 4, 6, and 8. The States FFY 2005 reported data for grade 10 reading are 33.6% and 33.6% for grade 10 math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 targets of 72% for grade 10 reading and 69% for grade 10 math.</p> <p>The State did not use all required measurements in reporting on this indicator.</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 indicated that it had aligned its targets with the No Child Left Behind Act targets and acknowledged that the disability subgroup did not meet any of its revised targets. The State did not use all required measurements for this indicator as required by OSEP's instructions for the FFY 2005 APR submission. The State reported that at the time of the FFY 2005 APR submission, it was unable to disaggregate data for children with IEPs who are proficient on the regular assessment with and without accommodations. However, since the State now collects and reports data on the number of children with IEPs who participate in regular assessments with accommodations, OSEP anticipates that the State will be able to report data on the proficiency rate of children with IEPs who take regular assessments with and without accommodations in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data reflecting all required measurements for Indicator 3C and demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 reported no FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State revised its baseline in its SPP and reported that in FFY 2004, 36 districts, or 21.3% of the State's school districts, have significant discrepancies in rates of long-term suspension and expulsion, based on 2004-</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that it did not report any data for Indicator 4A because data were not available at the time of the FFY 2005 APR submission, but that it would be meeting in Spring 2007 to develop strategies for timely reporting of data in the FFY 2006 APR. The State must report progress data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data on the percent of districts that the State identified with significant discrepancies in rates of long-term suspension or expulsion of children with disabilities in accordance with one of the comparisons in 34 CFR §300.170(a), in the FFY 2006 APR, due</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	2005 school year data.	<p data-bbox="1115 167 1325 196">February 1, 2008.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 215 2011 342">In the revisions to its SPP made in February of 2007, the State indicated that it was revising its baseline calculation to reflect FFY 2004 data, and clarified in its FFY 2005 APR that it had initially reported FFY 2003 baseline data in its SPP, submitted in December of 2005.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 362 2011 894">OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter indicated that the State was required to provide a progress report by April 18, 2006 on the results of the review and any appropriate revision of policies, procedures, and practices in accordance with 34 CFR §300.170(b), formerly 34 CFR §300.146(b), relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with Part B of the IDEA for those districts identified in the FFY 2003 APR with significant discrepancies in rates of long-term suspension and expulsion of children with disabilities. The State also was required to include the data in the FFY 2005 APR on the results of the review and any 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 for those districts the State identified with significant discrepancies in the SPP submitted in December of 2005. OSEP accepts the State's April 18, 2006 Progress Report.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 914 2011 1138">In the FFY 2005 APR, the State reported on its review, and if appropriate, revision of the 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 Part B of the IDEA for the 23 districts the State identified with significant discrepancies in the SPP submitted in December of 2005, based on FFY 2003 data.</p> <p data-bbox="1115 1157 2011 1357">Although the State revised its baseline in the SPP, the State did not report on the results of 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 Part B of the IDEA for the 36 districts identified with significant discrepancies in the revised SPP</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>submitted on February 1, 2007.</p> <p>In its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, 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: (1) the 36 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in the SPP revised in February of 2007 based on data for FFY 2004; (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies based on data from FFY 2005 that the State was required to report in the FFY 2005 APR; and (3) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. (The review of LEAs identified based on FFY 2005 data and the review of LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 APR may occur either during or after the FFY 2006 reporting period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR).</p>
<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; New]</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year's submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 65.2%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 62.5 %.</p> <p>B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 7.7%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 10%.</p> <p>C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 6.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 6%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its targets for Indicators 5A and 5B and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance for Indicator 5C.</p>
<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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 70%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 64%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
needs. [Results Indicator; New]		
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; New]	The State's reported baseline data for this indicator are 86.9%.	The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.
Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality		
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; New]	Using data from FFY 2004, the State reported that 0% of districts had disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported its baseline calculation using FFY 2004 data instead of FFY 2005 data. It also appears that following its determination of disproportionate representation based on the previous year's data, the State uses focused monitoring, data verification, policy and procedure review, and parent forums to identify issues and correct noncompliance the following year. Further, it appears that the State does not determine that the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification once the noncompliance is corrected.</p> <p>Indicator 9, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires the State to identify disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification, regardless of whether the noncompliance is subsequently corrected in a timely manner. The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, 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 progress data on the percent of districts identified, using data from FFY 2006, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>inappropriate identification, even if the determination of whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification occurs in the fall of 2007</p> <p>The State reported that it uses a 95% confidence interval to determine areas indicating possible overrepresentation, and that in the 2004-05 school year; it first identified overrepresentation as the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 9, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires the State to identify disproportionate representation, both under and overrepresentation, of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. Therefore, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information demonstrating that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</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; New]</p>	<p>Using data from FFY 2004, the State's reported baseline data for this indicator are that 2.4%, or 4 districts, had disproportionate representation in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>The State provided targets at 0% and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>In identifying districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, the State reported that it made the determination of disproportionate representation using FFY 2004-05 data and the determination of inappropriate identification was made in FFY 2005 using FFY 2005 data from those districts. The State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, 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 progress data on the percent of districts identified, using data from FFY 2006, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification occurs in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>Under Indicator 10, the State addressed disproportionate representation of Black and Hispanic students in the emotional disturbance and specific</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>learning disability categories, but does not report that it examined data for children with mental retardation, speech language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. OSEP's instructions for Indicator 10 require States, at a minimum to examine data for these six disability categories. In its FFY 2006 APR, the State must clarify that it examines data, at a minimum, for these six disability categories in determining whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>As noted under Indicator 9, the State also used the term overrepresentation in reporting under Indicator 10 and did not indicate that it examined data on underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, as required by 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). Therefore, we conclude that the State is not complying with 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3). To correct this noncompliance, the State must provide, in its FFY 2006 APR, information that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to report on the results of its review or if appropriate revision of policies, procedures, and practices in accordance with 34 CFR §300.755(b), [now 34 CFR §300.646] in the FFY 2005 APR. OSEP is satisfied that the State is complying with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.646(b)(1) requiring the review and appropriate revision of policies, procedures, and practices used in the identification or placement to ensure compliance with Part B of the IDEA.</p>
Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State reported baseline data for this indicator of 87.5%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based upon the State established timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.</p> <p>The State initially calculated its baseline data for this indicator as 83.5%.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>When the State found that reasons for extensions of the State-established timeframe were acceptable, an additional 584 students were added to the number found eligible within State-established timeline, and the baseline was recalculated as 87.5%. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1)(ii), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. OSEP has recalculated the State's FFY 2005 data as 97.4%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 85.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.132(b) [now 34 CFR §300.124(b)] was corrected by the time of the State's FFY 2005 APR submission. The State also was required to provide all required measurements for this indicator in reporting its data for Indicator 12 in the FFY 2005 APR. OSEP accepts the increase in the State's FFY 2005 reported data calculation, but has recalculated it as 97.4% instead of 97.6%.</p> <p>The State reported that it collects data for this indicator using census data. The State also described its thorough activities in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 to correct noncompliance with Indicator 12 that was identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. These included specific follow-up with all districts where all children referred from Part C did not receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) by their third birthday, moving assessment timelines to ensure more timely evaluation, and ensuring FAPE by age three for children who have summer birthdays. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, including data on any additional correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are that 97.8% of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that it used census data to report on Indicator 13. The State only reported on the percent and number of youth whose IEPs include coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services. It is unclear to OSEP whether the IEPs contain transition services that are reasonably designed to enable the student to reach the postsecondary goals.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	and transition services	<p>OSEP notes that the State reported that it has created a transitions goals checklist to assess whether or not the IEP goals will reasonably enable the student to meet their postsecondary goals.</p> <p>The State must report FFY 2006 data on the percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that include coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that are reasonably designed to enable the student to reach the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data on correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 a plan that describes how data will be collected.</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected. The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to revise its data collection system to ensure that the State would be able to report annually to the Department and the public on the State’s performance; and to report annually to the public on the performance of each LEA on the indicator. In addition, the State was instructed to include definitions for “competitively employed” and “postsecondary school.” The State reported the required information in its FFY 2005 APR.</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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 99.5%. This represents progress from the State’s FFY 2004 reported data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. The State reported correction of prior noncompliance with Indicator 12 and Indicator 15 relating to 34 CFR</p>	<p>The States FFY 2005 data for this indicator are that there were 234 findings of noncompliance—86 monitoring findings, 131 findings from complaints and 17 findings from due process hearings. The State indicated that of 86 monitoring findings, 69 were due for correction during the APR reporting period. The State also reported that the 131 findings from complaints and the 17 findings from due process hearings identified in FFY 2004 were corrected in FFY 2005. The State’s 99.5% calculation was based on 216 of 217 findings corrected within one year of identification during the APR reporting period. The State described its efforts to achieve compliance in the one urban school district where noncompliance regarding development and implementation of IEPs was identified in 2002. The State also reported</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	300.646(b).	<p>on its continuing efforts to correct identified noncompliance in that school district. Although the State provided explicit data on findings from complaints and due process hearings identified in FFY 2004 that were corrected in FFY 2005, the State did not report similar data on correction of its monitoring findings. Instead, the State reported an overall calculation of its FFY 2005 data that included its monitoring findings and provided more explicit data on findings from focused monitoring. However, it appears to OSEP that some of the focused monitoring findings were identified prior to the FFY 2005 APR reporting period and corrected during FFY 2005 and other findings were identified in FFY 2005 and were not due for correction until FFY 2006. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State must report data on findings of noncompliance identified through monitoring, complaints, and due process hearings, etc. in FFY 2005 that were due for correction in FFY 2006.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that noncompliance identified through monitoring, complaints, due process, etc was corrected within one year of identification. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with 20 USC 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600, including (1) data on its continuing efforts to correct outstanding noncompliance identified in 2002 in one urban school district, and (2) data, disaggregated by APR indicator on correction of outstanding noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 98.9%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported that the slippage was due to one complaint decision issued beyond the timeline. The State described its efforts including monitoring to ensure issuance of timely complaint decisions.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with 34 CFR §300.152.</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		demonstrate that complaint timelines were not extended unless the parties voluntarily agreed to engage in mediation and to extend the timeline. The State confirmed that it does not extend the 60-day timeline unless the parties voluntarily agree to engage in mediation and to extend the timeline.
<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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 95%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported that 18 of 19 hearings were fully adjudicated within the timeline or an allowable extension and that the one hearing decision that was not timely was issued one business day beyond the 45-day timeline.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the 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; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 67.2%</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 68.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 67%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 97.1%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported that Federal Tables 1 through 5 were submitted late with the number of days late ranging from eight to 29 days. The State has established new procedures for submitting data to reduce delays in the future. However, the State reported that due to State data collection practices, it will be unable to submit Table 5 within the Federal timelines for 2006-2007.</p> <p>Although the State noted that the APR was timely, the State did not provide FFY 2005 data for Indicators 1, 2, 4 A, 9 and 10, and did not provide complete measurements for Indicators 3B and 3C. The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).