

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results 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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 78.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 78.48%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table noted that Indicator 1 requires that States report on the percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma. At the time of the FFY 2005 APR submission, the State's SPP targets measured a percent of LEAs meeting or exceeding the graduation rates of a percent of youth with IEPs. OSEP advised the State to consider revising its targets by eliminating the reference to the percent of districts and to include only the percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma. The State has revised its targets accordingly.</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 targets and 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 3.82%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.61%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 4%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table noted that Indicator 2 requires that States report on the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. At the time of the FFY 2005 APR submission, the State's SPP targets measured a percent of LEAs with dropout rates at or below the State rate for grades 9-12. OSEP advised the State to consider revising its targets by eliminating the reference to the percent of districts and to include in its targets only the percent of students with IEPs dropping out of high school. The State has revised its targets accordingly.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 28.26%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 31.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 33%.</p>	<p>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>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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.59% for reading and 96.79% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 98.5% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 98.5% for math.</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>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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 21.41% for reading and 21.85% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 17.81% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 19.1% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 27% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 20% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.67%. These</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 description of the review, and if appropriate,</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 1.67%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>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 as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>While the State provided information about its review of policies, procedures and practices for the one LEA identified in the FFY 2005 APR with a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 school days in a school year, the State did not provide specific information on 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,” as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). Accordingly, OSEP is unable to determine whether the State is in compliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b). 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, as</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.																
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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. [Results Indicator]	Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																	
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="550 948 1421 1328"> <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>77.89%</td> <td>71.15%</td> <td>78.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>8.59%</td> <td>10.14%</td> <td>8.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>5.81%</td> <td>6.35%</td> <td>4.04%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	77.89%	71.15%	78.00%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.59%	10.14%	8.00%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.81%	6.35%	4.04%	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	77.89%	71.15%	78.00%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.59%	10.14%	8.00%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	5.81%	6.35%	4.04%															
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special	Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.																	

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>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>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="548 565 1419 1252"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 565 1062 737">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 565 1180 737">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 565 1297 737">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 565 1419 737">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 737 1062 808">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 737 1180 808">5.78%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 737 1297 808">2.51%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 737 1419 808">2.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 808 1062 943">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 808 1180 943">4.52%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 808 1297 943">7.54%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 808 1419 943">3.27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 943 1062 1045">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 943 1180 1045">42.96%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 943 1297 1045">48.49%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 943 1419 1045">39.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1045 1062 1148">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1045 1180 1148">29.4%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1045 1297 1148">30.91%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1045 1419 1148">31.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1148 1062 1252">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1148 1180 1252">17.34%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1148 1297 1252">10.55%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1148 1419 1252">23.37%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	5.78%	2.51%	2.76%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	4.52%	7.54%	3.27%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	42.96%	48.49%	39.2%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	29.4%	30.91%	31.4%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	17.34%	10.55%	23.37%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	5.78%	2.51%	2.76%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age peers.	4.52%	7.54%	3.27%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	42.96%	48.49%	39.2%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	29.4%	30.91%	31.4%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	17.34%	10.55%	23.37%																							
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 34.02 %. These</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																								

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 28%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 30.12 %.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. 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%. 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 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, a description of how it determines that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State provided this information. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. 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%. 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>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 description of how it determines that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc.). The State provided this information. 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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.78%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69.74%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that five of five findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	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 §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 86.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not make findings of noncompliance specific to particular LEAs for this indicator in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. Therefore, the State cannot report on the timely correction of prior noncompliance in particular LEAs or by findings for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. However, the State undertook a statewide systems approach to address noncompliance on this indicator resulting in the improved data for 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 demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. The State reported that to address noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and 2005, the State implemented a statewide technical assistance program. The State further reported that since it had made no LEA level findings of noncompliance for FFY 2004 or FFY 2005, it is unable to report on the correction of noncompliance for those years, but that no individual instances of noncompliance remain, either because the noncompliance was corrected or the child is no longer in a Part B early education program.</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 demonstration 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 34.54%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State used the incorrect measurement in FFY 2005, so the data are not comparable.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that two of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data that are aligned with this indicator. The State revised its measurement from reporting the percent of transition plans with an IEP that included coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, to reporting, as required in the indicator, the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner; however, the State's FFY 2005 data used an incorrect measurement.</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 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>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 87.37%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 96.72%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 98.53%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 59 of the 61 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining two findings were corrected 45 days beyond 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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five complaints. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that two of eight resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets until any FFY in which ten or</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	more resolution sessions were held.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 63%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 70%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).