

Florida 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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 45.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 39.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 40.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.39%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 4.0%.</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>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 7% in reading and 8% in math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4% in reading and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 10% in math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 40% in reading and 37% in math.</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>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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.1% for both reading and math. The FFY 2006 data were 96.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 96% for both reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 31.6% for reading and 35.3% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 29.9% for reading and 32.4% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 38% for reading and 40% for math.</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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 5.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 7.5%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 response letter required the State to describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007. 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>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.)</p> <p>In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the 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</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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>34 CFR §300.170(b).</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>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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1472 1312"> <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>57.9</td> <td>60.64</td> <td>56.8</td> <td>4.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>21.5</td> <td>18.4</td> <td>22.3</td> <td>3.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>-1.50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State's FFY 2007 data under IDEA section 618 for 5A are 62.1%.</p> <p>Both the State's and IDEA section 618 data represent progress for 5A. The State's FFY 2007 data represent progress for 5B and slippage for 5C from the</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.9	60.64	56.8	4.30%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	21.5	18.4	22.3	3.10%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.8	3.3	2.7	-1.50%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's effort to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.9	60.64	56.8	4.30%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	21.5	18.4	22.3	3.10%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.8	3.3	2.7	-1.50%																		

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	FFY 2006 data. The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.																									
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). [Results Indicator]	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.																								
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 781 1419 1464"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 781 1062 954">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 781 1180 954">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 781 1297 954">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 781 1419 954">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 954 1062 1024">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 954 1180 1024">1.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 954 1297 1024">1.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 954 1419 1024">1.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1024 1062 1159">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1024 1180 1159">11.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1024 1297 1159">22.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1024 1419 1159">14.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1159 1062 1261">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 1159 1180 1261">8.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1159 1297 1261">19.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1159 1419 1261">9.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1261 1062 1364">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1261 1180 1364">32.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1261 1297 1364">26.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1261 1419 1364">22.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1364 1062 1464">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1364 1180 1464">46.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1364 1297 1464">30.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1297 1364 1419 1464">52.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.7	1.7	1.7	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11.4	22.1	14.4	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	8.2	19.1	9.4	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32.0	26.6	22.1	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	46.7	30.5	52.4	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.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.7	1.7	1.7																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	11.4	22.1	14.4																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	8.2	19.1	9.4																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	32.0	26.6	22.1																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	46.7	30.5	52.4																							

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	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 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 these revisions.</p> <p>The State revised its targets for FFY 2008, 2009 and 2010 because the State plans to report the results from parents of preschool children and parents of children in grades K-12 separately. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. OSEP accepts the revised targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 30%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 32% for this indicator.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State'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 (zero) with disproportionate representation of racial and 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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to make determinations for FFYs 2005, 2006 and 2007 and report the results of those determinations in the FFY 2007 APR. Further, if the State identified any LEAs as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were the result of inappropriate identification based on data for FFYs 2005 and 2006, the State was required to</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 specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>describe in the FFY 2007 APR its determinations of whether the LEAs identified 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 no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on the State’s calculation of the data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 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 on the actions the State took as result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance from 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 09-02).</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>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 94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 was corrected. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that all 58 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on:</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) 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 §300.301(c), 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</p>

Florida 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) 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 on the actions the State took as result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>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 requirement(s); 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.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 68.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 46 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 demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 was corrected. The State provided information in the FFY 2007 APR that all outstanding noncompliance from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 was 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>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.</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,</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 24%. The FFY 2006 data were 76%.</p> <p>The State revised its data collection system from one based on cyclical monitoring to a more comprehensive web-based statewide self-assessment system. Therefore, the data are not comparable and OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage.</p> <p>The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to ensure that it will be able to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 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>The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the remaining finding, the State reported that it has provided technical assistance and training and the district will be subject to on-site monitoring during 2008-09.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2006 was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by 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 corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA,</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 55%. The FFY 2006 data were 55.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 55.7%.</p>	<p>consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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 revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, information that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that 240 of 241 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it provided technical assistance and training and has targeted the LEA for on-site monitoring during 2008-09.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 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 on the actions the State took as result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 12, 2009 verification letter required the State to provide OSEP within 60 days of the date of this letter the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A written assurance that Florida is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.222, which states that an SEA may not reduce the amount of Part B funds provided to the LEA or State agency unless the SEA has provided reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the LEA or State agency; 2) Information on the status of the legislative actions outlined in FDE's July 19, 2008 correspondence to OSEP; and 3) a copy of a memorandum or other written or electronic notice sent to all LEAs, and other relevant public agencies as defined by 34 CFR §300.33, directing them not to appeal due process hearings to courts that do not hear additional evidence, such as the State Court of Appeals. 4) Documentation that, consistent with

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>section 616(a) and section 616(e) of IDEA, the State’s procedures for making future annual determinations of the performance of its LEAs includes consideration of an LEA’s performance on all SPP compliance indicators.</p> <p>The State provided the required information on May 11, 2009. No further action is necessary.</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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in 2006 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</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</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 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>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 timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 52%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Florida Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2007 target of 57.5%. The State reported that 58 of 84 resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75%-85%.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.2%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.	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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.