

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

While the State has publicly reported on the performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by IDEA section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I), those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the State has not reported local data on Indicators 1 and 2.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 83%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 3.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 3.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>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 41%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not report FFY 2005 data for this indicator. Data were not available for FFY 2005 because there were no test results for elementary and middle school students for the reporting period. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 43%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on the results of monitoring on district wide assessment requirements. 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: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data, for grades 3 through 8, for this indicator are 98.8% for reading and 98.6% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State’s FFY 2005 data is only for high school and the State’s FFY 2006</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on grades 3 through 8. The State reported the required information. A May 23, 2007 letter from the Secretary</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data is only for grades 3 through 8.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 96.18% for both reading and math.</p>	<p>of the U.S. Department of Education approved the State's amended Accountability plan and acknowledged that the State would implement a new high school assessment in Fall 2007. Based on the change in the administration of the grade 10 test, the State did not submit the required data for grade 10 and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 grades 3 through 8, for this indicator are 29.12% for reading and 28.36% for math.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2005 data is only for high school and the State's FFY 2006 data is only for grades 3 through 8.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 40.84% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 50.74% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data on grades 3 through 8. The State reported the required data.</p> <p>A May 23, 2007 letter from the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education approved the State's amended Accountability plan and acknowledged that the State would implement a new high school assessment in Fall 2007. Based on the change in the timing of the administration of the grade 10 test, the State did not submit the required data for grade 10 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>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the definition of “significant discrepancy” for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 3.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 2.26%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of <2.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the description of the review 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 IDEA for the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 and 2006 APRs. The State provided the required information for FFY 2005.</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 identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>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>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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 651 1419 1029"> <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>76.3%</td> <td>65.03%</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>13.34%</td> <td>3.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>4.0%</td> <td>4.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5C and slippage for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	76.3%	65.03%	76%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	3.2%	13.34%	3.3%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.3%	4.0%	4.3%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance for 5A and 5B 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.	76.3%	65.03%	76%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	3.2%	13.34%	3.3%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.3%	4.0%	4.3%															
<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>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
[Results Indicator]																										
<p>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="548 347 1465 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 347 968 521">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="968 347 1131 521">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1131 347 1297 521">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 347 1465 521">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 521 968 589">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="968 521 1131 589">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1131 521 1297 589">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 521 1465 589">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 589 968 725">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="968 589 1131 725">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1131 589 1297 725">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 589 1465 725">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 725 968 862">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same age peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="968 725 1131 862">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1131 725 1297 862">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 725 1465 862">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 862 968 998">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="968 862 1131 998">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1131 862 1297 998">100%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 862 1465 998">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 998 968 1097">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="968 998 1131 1097">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1131 998 1297 1097">0%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 998 1465 1097">100%</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.	0%	0%	0%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.	0%	0%	0%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same age peers but did not reach it.	0%	0%	0%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers.	100%	100%	0%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers.	0%	0%	100%	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit a definition of “comparable to same age peers” in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State provided the required information.</p> <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.	0%	0%	0%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers.	0%	0%	0%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same age peers but did not reach it.	0%	0%	0%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers.	100%	100%	0%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers.	0%	0%	100%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 72%.</p> <p>This data represents progress from the FFY 2005 data of 70.5%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 72%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data derived from census data, from a sampling plan approved by OSEP or another method approved by OSEP. The State did not submit census data that was proposed in the FFY 2005 APR due to State reported</p>																								

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>problems with the vendor. Rather, the State sent surveys to a sample of parents and reported that it intends to use census data in the 2007-2008 school year.</p> <p>If the State has collected, or is planning on collecting, data for the 2007-2008 year for this indicator through sampling, it must submit its sampling methodology for this indicator as soon as possible in order to ensure that its FFY 2007 data, due to OSEP on February 1, 2009, will be valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State must ensure that its FFY 2007 data submitted in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, is derived from census data, from a sampling plan approved by OSEP, or another method approved by OSEP.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services 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, data based on the appropriate measurement including examining for both over and underrepresentation, a description of its review of data and information for all racial and ethnic groups, and a description of how it determined if disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State was required to make this determination on an annual basis.</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State was also required to provide its definition of disproportionate representation and clarify whether the State has the same definition for significant disproportionality under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2) as it has for disproportionate representation.</p> <p>The State addressed the requirements and 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 this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data based on the appropriate measurement including both over and underrepresentation, a description of its review of data and information for all racial and ethnic groups in the State, and a description of how it determines if there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State was required to make this determination on an annual basis.</p> <p>The State was also required to provide its definition of disproportionate representation and clarify whether the State has the same definition for significant disproportionality under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2) as it has for disproportionate representation.</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State addressed the requirements and provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding compliance with this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 16 findings identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported in Indicator 11 that it sent letters to each school district, and depending upon the level of noncompliance, the letter directed the school district to (1) come into compliance, (2) complete a self-assessment and submit a report to the State with assurances that the noncompliance would be corrected, or (3) work directly with the State's technical assistance consultant to complete a corrective action plan.</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, a report on the range of delays beyond the timeline for evaluations and the reasons for the delays. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected in a timely manner. 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 timely evaluations 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 88.26%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the</p>	<p>The State must provide the required range of days and reasons for delay in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>delays. The State reported that 100% of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. The State also reported in Indicator 15 that two of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. 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 early childhood transition 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 40%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that nine of nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. 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 is in compliance with the secondary transition 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>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State’s FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 87%.</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, a definition of “postsecondary” education. The State provided the required</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator; New]		<p>definition.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 72%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 98 out of 136 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. The State also reported that of the 38 issues of noncompliance that were not corrected within the timelines, 28 have been subsequently corrected. For the remaining 10 findings of noncompliance, which are from 7 districts and approved private special education programs, the State has approved corrective action plans with timelines for correction, including onsite visits for technical assistance specific to the findings, onsite compliance verification visits, review of implementation or corrective action for progress or lack of progress, and possible redirection of IDEA funds for FFY 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification whether its FFY 2005 reported data reflects findings made in 2004-05 and corrected in 2005-06 in a one-year timeframe or findings made in 2005-06 and corrected in 2005-06.</p> <p>The State clarified that the FFY 2005 reported findings were made in 2004-2005 and corrected in 2005-2006 in a one-year timeframe.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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. [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%. The State met its 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. [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%. 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 resolutions 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. [Results Indicator]</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. The State's FFY 2006 reported data are 38.7% and that is the State's baseline.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 51.5%. This represents slippage for the FFY 2005 reported data of 88.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 79%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 85.6%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).