

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 29.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 32.54%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 33.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.¹</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.17%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 2.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 3.9%.</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>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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 77%.</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>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 99%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

¹ OSEP notes that the targets that the State has established for Indicators 1, 3C, 5A and 14 are stated as a percentage increase, and in the case of Indicators 2, 5B and 5C, a percentage decrease, from the prior year's performance. It is OSEP's understanding that the State intends that each of these targets means that the State will be able to report improvement in performance over the six year period of the SPP. The State must ensure that, notwithstanding the performance level the State reports for these indicators in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the targets in the State's FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, reflect improvement from the State's baseline for Indicators 1, 2, 3C, 5, and 14.

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 39%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 36%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 42.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 6.87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 13%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 8%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, a description of the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). The State provided this information. OSEP's response table also required the State to 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>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must again 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	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 2006 and 2007.	required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).																				
<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]</p>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																				
<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="569 849 1451 1328"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>74.06</td> <td>79.42</td> <td>75.06</td> <td>5.36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>6.12</td> <td>6.06</td> <td>6.02</td> <td>0.06%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.75</td> <td>2.67</td> <td>2.65</td> <td>0.08%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data. The State met all of its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	74.06	79.42	75.06	5.36%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.12	6.06	6.02	0.06%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.75	2.67	2.65	0.08%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	74.06	79.42	75.06	5.36%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.12	6.06	6.02	0.06%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.75	2.67	2.65	0.08%																		

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<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>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="569 613 1451 1333"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="569 613 1052 789">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1052 613 1184 789">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1184 613 1316 789">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1316 613 1451 789">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 789 1052 857">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 789 1184 857">2.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 789 1316 857">3.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 789 1451 857">2.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 857 1052 992">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 857 1184 992">5.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 857 1316 992">8.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 857 1451 992">4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 992 1052 1094">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 992 1184 1094">14.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 992 1316 1094">24.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 992 1451 1094">10.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1094 1052 1196">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 1094 1184 1196">25.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1094 1316 1196">30.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 1094 1451 1196">19.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1196 1052 1299">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 1196 1184 1299">52.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1196 1316 1299">33.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 1196 1451 1299">63.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1299 1052 1333">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1052 1299 1184 1333">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1299 1316 1333">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1316 1299 1451 1333">100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.3	3.9	2.2	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.1	8.1	4.4	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	14.8	24.4	10.6	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.7	30.2	19.6	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	52.1	33.4	63.2	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.3	3.9	2.2																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.1	8.1	4.4																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	14.8	24.4	10.6																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.7	30.2	19.6																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	52.1	33.4	63.2																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%																											
<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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 86.80%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 88.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1,</p>																												

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		<p>2010.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.53%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating compliance for the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported that the two LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 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).</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.40%. These</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84.13%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 15 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. The State reported that all remaining findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 have been corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>manner. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.88%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94.07%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that all nine of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance from FFY 2005. The State reported that all findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 have been corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.51%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.44%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 79.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 79.7%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.79%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 163 of 165 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the remaining two findings subsequently were corrected within six months from the one-year timeline.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Alabama's Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 25.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 17.74%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 48%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 78.72%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 67.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>