

Wisconsin 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’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 81.4%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 80.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR the baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. 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 target and 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’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 2.13%. This represents slippage from the State’s FFY 2004 reported data of 2.09%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 2.09%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator to include FFY 2004 baseline and FFY 2005 progress data, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must revise the SPP to include the improvement activities and submit the revised SPP to OSEP with its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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>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 this indicator are 96.4% for both reading and math. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 75%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its 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</p>	<p>The State’s reported FFY 2005 data by grade and content areas for this indicator</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline data for this indicator in the SPP to add baseline data for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>are:</p> <p>Grade 4 Reading - 99.13%;</p> <p>Grade 4 Math - 99.26%;</p> <p>Grade 8 Reading - 98.71%;</p> <p>Grade 8 Math - 98.61%;</p> <p>Grade 10 Reading - 96.33%;</p> <p>Grade 10 Math - 96.42%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 95% in all grade and content areas for this indicator.</p>	<p>the February 1, 2007 APR data regarding the participation rate of students with disabilities who took regular assessments with accommodations. The State included those data in the APR.</p> <p>As noted in OSEP's February 9, 2007 verification visit letter, OSEP identified noncompliance with the requirements of sections 612(a)(16) and 614(d)(1)(A)(i)(VI) of the IDEA with respect to districtwide assessments. OSEP's letter required the State to submit documentation, by the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that the State has corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State reporting complete data in the FFY 2006 APR.</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's reported FFY 2005 data for Reading for this indicator are:</p> <p>Grade 4 - 52.94%;</p> <p>Grade 8 - 49.19%; and</p> <p>Grade 10 - 32.10%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 Reading target of 67.5%. The State demonstrated progress from FFY 2004 reported data of 52.91% for Grade 4 Reading; and 48.63% for Grade 8 Reading. The State demonstrated slippage from FFY 2004 reported data of 35.61% for Grade 10 Reading.</p> <p>The State's reported FFY 2005 data for Math for this</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline data for this indicator in the SPP to add baseline data for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>indicator are:</p> <p>Grade 4 - 48.21%;</p> <p>Grade 8 - 34.86%; and</p> <p>Grade 10 - 28.38%.</p> <p>For Grade 4, the State met its FFY 2005 Math target of 47.5%, but did not meet its targets for Grade 8 (24.31%) or Grade 10 (28.72%).</p> <p>The State demonstrated progress from FFY 2004 reported data of 34.31% for Grade 8 Math.</p> <p>The State demonstrated slippage from FFY 2004 reported data of 28.72% for Grade 10 Math.</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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 4.0%. This represents slippage from the State's revised FFY 2004 reported data of 3.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 3.42%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrated compliance with 34 CFR §300.146(b) (now 34 CFR §300.170(b)).</p> <p>The State reported in the FFY 2005 APR that all LEAs identified during the 2004-05 school year as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension/expulsions of children with disabilities for more than 10 days in a school year provided an assurance to Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) that they had completed a review and revised, if necessary, their policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices comply with Part B, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State further reported that the State reviewed all of the assurances and improvement plans submitted by LEAs to verify full</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance with this requirement. The State has demonstrated compliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</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>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>
<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>A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 50.83%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 49.45%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 51%.</p> <p>B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 12.09%. This</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the APR, due February 1, 2007, both accurate baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). In the APR, the State confirmed that the FFY 2004 data reported in the SPP were accurate; however, OSEP notes that in the SPP, the State reported 49.54%, rather than the correct percentage of 49.45% for Indicator 5A. OSEP believes this is a typographical error.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 12.20%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 11.5%.</p> <p>C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 1.43%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 1.44%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.25%.</p>	performance for Indicator 5 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<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 35.47%. This represents slippage from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 35.86%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 35.86%.</p>	<p>The State revised its method of collecting data for this indicator and included this revision in the APR. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State did not make the revisions in its SPP. The State must revise the SPP and submit it to OSEP with its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	Entry data provided.	<p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to explain how the State addressed the deficiencies in its plan for collecting data for this indicator. The State revised its plan for collecting data for this indicator. With the exception of Milwaukee Public Schools, the State will not sample. Instead, the State will gather census data in each district once during the course of the SPP and will gather sampling data every year from the Milwaukee Public Schools. OSEP approved this sampling plan.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving	The State's FFY 2005	The State provided baseline, targets and improvement activities, and OSEP

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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; New]</p>	<p>reported baseline data for this indicator are 72.04%.</p>	<p>accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</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; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 2.27%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the needed baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. The State provided baseline, targets, and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified 2.27% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State's definition of disproportionate representation includes a discussion of overrepresentation of certain racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State provided data only on <u>overrepresentation</u> of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 9, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires States to identify disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of races and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify whether it provided data for FFY 2005 for underrepresentation and overrepresentation. If the State determines that it did not examine data for underrepresentation, 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 races and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrate that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</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>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 5.68%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that any activities or strategies regarding this indicator result in the collection of the needed baseline data, for the required time period, and that the baseline data and any other required data are reported in the APR. The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State identified 5.68% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. However, the State's definition of disproportionate representation includes a discussion of overrepresentation of certain racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State provided data only on overrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 10, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600(d)(3), requires States to identify disproportionate representation, both overrepresentation and underrepresentation, of races and ethnicities in specific disability categories.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify whether it provided data for FFY 2005 for underrepresentation and overrepresentation. If the State determines that it did not examine data for underrepresentation, 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 races and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data and information in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures that prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity of children as children</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		with disabilities, as required by 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrate that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
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's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 88.41%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State reported data based on the Federal timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.</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 §300.301(c)(1), 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 65.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage because the State used FFY 2005 data to establish its baseline.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in the SPP, and will use FFY 2005 data for its baseline. OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>In its December 2005 SPP, the State provided data regarding the percent of children referred by Part C who were <u>found eligible</u> by their third birthday, not, as required by the SPP instructions, the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who <u>had an IEP developed and implemented</u> by their third birthdays. OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the February 1, 2007 APR, the correct measurement in reporting its data for this indicator. The State provided the required measurement for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124, including data on the correction of outstanding 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are 7.4%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>		<p>compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating 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 post-secondary 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>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 reported data are 100%. This data is not valid and reliable because the State used the wrong measurement.</p>	<p>The measurement for this indicator required the State to report the percent of <u>findings</u> of noncompliance <u>identified in FFY 2004</u> (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) that were corrected within one year from identification in FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). The State reported in its FFY 2005 APR that 100% of Wisconsin's LEAs corrected noncompliance identified during the 2005-2006 school year no later than one year after identification. The State also reported that all noncompliance identified in 2005-2006 through focused monitoring was corrected with one year. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report valid and reliable data regarding the percent of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) that were corrected within one year from identification in FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006), and valid and reliable data regarding the percent of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) that were corrected within one year from identification in FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007).</p> <p>In addition, the targets for Indicator 15 in the SPP must be revised to read "100% of findings of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification." The State should submit this revision when it submits its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 3B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
<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 89%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 reported data of 84%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities. OSEP accepts these revisions. OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that the noncompliance is corrected and include data in the 2007 APR that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State's data indicate noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.152. 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 full compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.152, including data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance, and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515(a).</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 reported baseline data of 50%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities. 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 83.33%. The State met its target of 75%.</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>The State's FFY 2004 reported new baseline data for this indicator are 90%. The</p>	<p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 response to the State's SPP suggested that the State reconsider its baseline data and provide accurate information, including improvement activities, in the APR, due February 1, 2007. The State</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 98%, and this represents progress. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>revised the baseline and added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In its February 9, 2007 verification letter, OSEP found that the State was not in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.641(a), which requires that, for purposes of the annual report required by section 618 of the Act and 34 CFR §300.640, the State must count and report the number of children with disabilities receiving special education and related services on any date between October 1 and December 1 of each year. OSEP's letter required the State to submit, within 60 days from the date of the February 9, 2007 letter, its plan for correcting this noncompliance, and ensuring that the State's next submission of child count data under section 618 meets the requirements in 34 CFR §300.641(a) for a count date between October 1 and December 1. On April 4, 2007, the State submitted its plan for ensuring compliance with that requirement. OSEP accepts the State's plan. With its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report on implementation of this plan to ensure compliance with the timeline in 34 CFR §300.641(a). Further, the State must ensure that the child count data that the State submits for FFY 2007 and subsequent years meet that requirement.</p> <p>In addition, the State did not submit valid and reliable data for Indicators 9, 10 and 15.</p> <p>The State must provide data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>