

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and targets for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 43%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 48.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 43%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 2.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 2.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.91%.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State confirmed that the State updated the SPP to include the revised activities that it included in its FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 76.5%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 65%.</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 that are consistent with data in Table 6 and the State met this requirement.</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>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99% for reading and 99% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress for reading from the FFY 2005 data reported in Table 6 of 92.9%, and the FFY 2005 data reported in Table 6 for math of</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR, the State reported APR data that were consistent with Table 6.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>94.6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</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 activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 62% for reading and 58% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data reported in Table 6 of 59.98% for reading and 50.75% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 73% for reading and 71% for math.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR, the State reported APR data that were consistent with Table 6.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 29.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 26.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 21.5%.</p> <p>The State did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), its 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2004 or 2005.</p> <p>The State did not provide the information required by the FFY 2005 response table related to ensuring that all LEAs identified with significant discrepancies being required to review, and if appropriate, revise their policies, procedures, and practices, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) each year.</p>	<p>The State did not, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, include in the February 1, 2008 APR, a description 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 all LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in FFY 2004, FFY 2005, and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>Further, the State did not, as also required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, clarify the improvement activity of reviewing at least 25% of LEAs per year, to ensure that all</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>LEAs identified with significant discrepancies are required to review, and if appropriate, revise their policies, procedures, and practices, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) each year.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, 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 2005 and FFY 2006, and must clarify that the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices is conducted on an annual basis for all districts identified for that year with significant discrepancies.</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</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>	

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]																		
<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="550 396 1419 776"> <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>56%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>14%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>3.78%</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for Indicators 5A and 5B, and progress for Indicator 5C.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	56%	54%	60%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14%	18%	12%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.78%	3.6%	2%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	56%	54%	60%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	14%	18%	12%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.78%	3.6%	2%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</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>																

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p align="center">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p align="center">Social Emotional</p>	<p align="center">Knowledge &amp; Skills</p>	<p align="center">Appropriate Behavior</p>	
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p align="center">3%</p>	<p align="center">3%</p>	<p align="center">3%</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">14%</p>	<p align="center">18%</p>	<p align="center">13%</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p align="center">29%</p>	<p align="center">44%</p>	<p align="center">22%</p>	
	<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">22%</p>	<p align="center">24%</p>	<p align="center">23%</p>	
	<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">32%</p>	<p align="center">11%</p>	<p align="center">39%</p>	
	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 64.3%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 65%.</p>				<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State addressed the representativeness of the response rate for this indicator.  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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 6%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.  The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to</p>				<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided its definition of disproportionate representation and a description of how the</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>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>State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State addressed overrepresentation and underrepresentation of all racial and ethnic groups and provided an "n" size of 50 or less.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided its definition of disproportionate representation and a description of how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Additionally, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State addressed overrepresentation and underrepresentation of all racial and ethnic groups and provided an "n" size of 50 or less.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173,</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 92.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 96 of 96 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that prior noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c) (1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 89.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 30 of 30 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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 70%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 76.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 22 of 22 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>§300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 84%.</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 97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 196 of 202 FFY 2005 findings were corrected within one year from identification, and that the remaining six findings were corrected within 60 days after the one year timeline.</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 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>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>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 complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**Virginia Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on eight hearings. 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 regarding compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 44%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 30%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 82%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 76-80%.</p>	<p>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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 89.29%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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 is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>