

California 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement (benchmarks) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data are 70% of districts that met or exceeded graduation benchmarks. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised the measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 90% of districts that met or exceeded graduation benchmarks.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported 618 data, due on November 1, 2008, are 50.89% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 55.22% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</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>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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 91% of districts that met or exceeded established annual benchmarks for dropout. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 96%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 87% of districts that met or exceeded established annual benchmarks for dropout.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported 618 data, due on November 1, 2008, are 21.46% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. The FFY 2006 data were 20.85% of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 24.85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 35.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 56%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																			
<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 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 96.9% for reading and 98.2% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94.3% for reading and 96.4% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95% for reading and math.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, documentation that it reports to the public the number of children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate in regular assessments, with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports assessment results for children without disabilities, as required by 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)(D)(i) and 34 CFR §300.160. The State provided the required information.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 849 1419 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Reading</td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unified, HS 7-12, COE</td> <td align="center">20.8%</td> <td align="center">24.19%</td> <td align="center">34%</td> <td align="center">24.3%</td> <td align="center">27.66%</td> <td align="center">34.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elem, Mid</td> <td align="center">22.7%</td> <td align="center">26.28%</td> <td align="center">35.2%</td> <td align="center">26.6%</td> <td align="center">30.28%</td> <td align="center">37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS 9-12</td> <td align="center">16.3%</td> <td align="center">18.55%</td> <td align="center">33.4%</td> <td align="center">17.1%</td> <td align="center">17.43%</td> <td align="center">32.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			Unified, HS 7-12, COE	20.8%	24.19%	34%	24.3%	27.66%	34.6%	Elem, Mid	22.7%	26.28%	35.2%	26.6%	30.28%	37%	HS 9-12	16.3%	18.55%	33.4%	17.1%	17.43%	32.2%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
Unified, HS 7-12, COE	20.8%	24.19%	34%	24.3%	27.66%	34.6%																															
Elem, Mid	22.7%	26.28%	35.2%	26.6%	30.28%	37%																															
HS 9-12	16.3%	18.55%	33.4%	17.1%	17.43%	32.2%																															
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 10.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 10.3%.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected.</p>																																			

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 10.3%.</p> <p>The State reported that 2,929 of 2,943 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009.</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 report on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 under this indicator and 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 the IDEA for the remaining LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006. The State provided the required information.</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>For this indicator, the State calculated the percent of districts with rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year that exceed one percent. The State's SPP, as approved by OSEP, set out the threshold as the State's average percentage. However, the State did not establish that the one percent threshold that was the State average in FFY 2004 continued to be the State average for suspensions and expulsions in FFY 2007. The OSEP Indicator Measurement Table and 34 CFR §300.170(a) require the State to examine data to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities: (1) among LEAs in the State; or (2) compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those agencies. Therefore, OSEP is concerned that the State may not be accurately identifying significant discrepancies among districts based on the current State average. In its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report consistent with the approved SPP and, based on FFY 2008 data, recalculate its threshold and determine the percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion of children with</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year using the revised threshold. The State must also do this for subsequent years.</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 required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</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>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	February 1, 2010.
	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	49.5	52.35	57	2.85%	
	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	25.6	22.62	21	2.98%	
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.1	4.48	4.1	-0.37%	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B, and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p>					
<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>	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>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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</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.

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p align="center">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p align="center">Social Emotional</p>	<p align="center">Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p align="center">Appropriate Behavior</p>	
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p align="center">7</p>	<p align="center">4</p>	<p align="center">12</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">19</p>	<p align="center">22</p>	<p align="center">15</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p align="center">17</p>	<p align="center">17</p>	<p align="center">21</p>	
	<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">15</p>	<p align="center">16</p>	<p align="center">15</p>	
	<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">42</p>	<p align="center">42</p>	<p align="center">38</p>	
	<p>Total (approx. 100%)</p>	<p align="center">100.00 %</p>	<p align="center">101.00 %</p>	<p align="center">101.00 %</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.</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 83.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 87.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 78%.</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, its analysis of whether its FFY 2007 data are representative of the population. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. The State reported that it is working with the Improving Special Education Services stakeholder group which includes the Parent Training and Information Centers and the SELPA Director organization to design a universal sample to be collected in 2009-2010. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	provided improvement activities to address this issue.	State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.
<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 5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 4.19%.</p> <p>The State did not meet 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>The State reported that 36 of 36 districts identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services 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. The State reported that 22 of 36 districts had timely correction of noncompliance and the remaining 14 districts subsequently corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006. For the districts that did not timely correct noncompliance, the State reported that it provided individual technical assistance and/or on-site visits.</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.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services 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. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance was corrected by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, 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-</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>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 the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised baseline data for FFY 2005 and data for FFY 2006 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 14.4%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2006 data of 1.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007, FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that 15 of 15 districts 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>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 baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and revised FFY 2006 data regarding the number and percent of districts with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided the required information.</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</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.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 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. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the noncompliance was corrected by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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>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>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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that 4,557 of 4,560 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that the three remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009 and districts with late correction were provided individual technical assistance and/or on-site visits.</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. 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. 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 Memo 09-02. 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 75.62%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 476 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</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 §300.124(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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 94.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1601 of 1605 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2009.</p>	<p>APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 71%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 69.25%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 66%. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue. 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 from all SELPAs or explain why data for the three SELPAs were excluded from the census data. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.12%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 45,940 of 46,707 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that 764 of the 767 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2009. The State reported that the remaining three findings were from Developmental Centers (State hospitals) operated by the Department of Developmental Services. The State further explained that correction of noncompliance in these districts has raised significant issues of jurisdiction and authority under State law and that this problem is compounded by the fact that key staff members of the Department of Developmental Services were recently laid off due to budget cuts. The State reported that it is trying to resolve this problem through the interagency agreement process.</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>FFY 2007 APR.</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 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</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		15 Worksheet.
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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>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 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 due process hearing timelines 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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 40%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 58%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 61%.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 74%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 43%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 46%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

California Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 95.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 91.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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 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>