

Georgia 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 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 37.74%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 32.93%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 36%.</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. [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 5.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.77%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 5.6%.</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. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 51.44%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 52.60%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 74.34%.</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: 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</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 99.14% for reading and 99.11% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99.14% for reading. The FFY 2006 data for math were 99.12%. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 98.54% for reading and 98.53% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
standards. [Results Indicator]		
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	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 65.73% for reading and 45.56% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 64.59% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 51.57% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 66% for reading and 53.77% for math.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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]	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 0.54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.89%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 3.83%. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner. The State made no findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. 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 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 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 34 CFR §300.170(b).
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by	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.

Georgia 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 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>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="548 651 1467 1130"> <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>55.43</td> <td>60</td> <td>59</td> <td>4.57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>19.66</td> <td>16.7</td> <td>18</td> <td>2.96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.91</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>-0.31%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	55.43	60	59	4.57%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	19.66	16.7	18	2.96%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.6	1.91	0.9	-0.31%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 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.	55.43	60	59	4.57%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	19.66	16.7	18	2.96%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.6	1.91	0.9	-0.31%																		
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing</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>																				

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>																														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 500 1419 1252"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 500 1062 672">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 500 1182 672">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 500 1302 672">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 500 1419 672">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 672 1062 740">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 672 1182 740">2.75</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 672 1302 740">3.51</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 672 1419 740">2.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 740 1062 875">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 740 1182 875">10.98</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 740 1302 875">26.44</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 740 1419 875">9.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 875 1062 979">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 875 1182 979">20.52</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 875 1302 979">42.92</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 875 1419 979">15.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 979 1062 1083">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 979 1182 1083">9.43</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 979 1302 1083">18.98</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 979 1419 1083">8.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1083 1062 1182">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1083 1182 1182">56.32</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1083 1302 1182">8.15</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1083 1419 1182">64.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1182 1062 1252">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1182 1182 1252">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1182 1302 1252">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1182 1419 1252">99.99%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.75	3.51	2.33	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	10.98	26.44	9.24	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	20.52	42.92	15.35	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	9.43	18.98	8.19	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	56.32	8.15	64.88	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.99%	<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.	2.75	3.51	2.33																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	10.98	26.44	9.24																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	20.52	42.92	15.35																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	9.43	18.98	8.19																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	56.32	8.15	64.88																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.99%																											
<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>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 27%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 30%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 36%.</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>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey</p>																												

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	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.	response group that is not representative of the State's population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the 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.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the State's calculation of the data.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.08%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.71%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%. 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 that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported that all five 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. 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 documentation.	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. 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 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.

Georgia 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 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 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 09-02).</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 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 89.13%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 88.28%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 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 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 timely initial evaluations 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)(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</p>

Georgia 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’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 documentation.</p>	<p>implementing the specific regulatory requirement; 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 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 96.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 14 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 from FFY 2005 was corrected. The State provided the required documentation.</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>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 requirement; 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</p>

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 85.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 10 of 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the three districts that did not correct noncompliance in a timely manner were required to amend their Corrective Action Plans to include directed technical assistance, regular progress monitoring, and other district-specific activities. Additionally, each district must work with its district liaison and the State transition specialist and participate in monthly progress monitoring.</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.</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 the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</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 §300.320(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR (three findings from FFY 2006 and the findings from FFY 2007).</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,</p>

Georgia 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 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 74.79%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 55.13%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 56%.</p>	<p>consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 98.73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.52%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 234 of 237 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 to the LEAs, required the LEAs to submit an amended Corrective Action Plan with specific targeted activities, and required the LEAs to meet regularly with their district liaisons.</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 documentation.</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 noncompliance the State identified in FFY 2006.</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 requirement, consistent with</p>

Georgia 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>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>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 81.08%. OSEP could not determine progress or slippage because in OSEP's November 3, 2008 Verification Visit letter to the State, OSEP required the State to revise the previous calculation to ensure that data reported for FFY 2007 are consistent with the timeline requirements of Part B of the IDEA.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>In OSEP's November 3, 2008 Verification Visit letter to the State, OSEP required the State to provide documentation with its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the State: (1) complies with the 60-day time limit for issuing a written decision for a State complaint, and begins the 60-day timeline on the date that the State receives the complaint (34 CFR §300.152(a)); and (2) issues written decisions to each complainant that address each allegation in the State complaint (34 CFR §300.152(a)(5)). The State previously submitted a copy of its revised complaint procedures, in which the State clarified that the State will begin the 60-day timeline on the date on which the State receives the complaint. In addition, the State selected three complaints received in FFY 2008 that it submitted with the FFY 2007 APR. The three complaints are date-stamped for receipt and the corresponding tracking sheets for those complaints show that the State began</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p> <p>In OSEP's November 3, 2008 Verification Visit letter to the State, OSEP required the State to provide documentation with its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the State: (1) complies with the 60-day time limit for issuing a written decision for a State complaint, and begins the 60-day timeline on the date that the State receives the complaint (34 CFR §300.152(a)); and (2) issues written decisions to each complainant that address each allegation in the State complaint (34 CFR</p>

Georgia 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 60-day timeline on the date received.</p> <p>Regarding the requirement that each written decision address all allegations in the State complaint, the previously-submitted copy of its revised complaint procedures clarifies that complaint decisions will address each allegation in the State complaint. With the FFY 2007 APR, the State submitted copies of three complaints as well as corresponding decision letters. In one of these decision letters, the State did not address the allegation in the complaint that the student's placement was determined by available funding. In another complaint, the parent alleged that notice in accordance with 34 CFR §300.322 was not provided to the parent on more than one occasion. The State addressed only one of the occasions raised in the complaint.</p>	<p>§300.152(a)(5)). The State provided documentation showing the correction of the noncompliance regarding timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152(a). However, the documentation provided by the State, addressing each specific allegation of Part B that was included in each State complaint, was not sufficient to show compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.152(a)(5).</p> <p>By November 17, 2009, the State must submit to OSEP documentation that the State issues written decisions to each complainant that address each allegation in the State complaint. The State's documentation must include, but is not limited to, all State complaint written decisions issued between November 3, 2008 and November 2, 2009.</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 66.6%. These data are based on three due process hearings. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>In OSEP's November 3, 2008 Verification Visit letter to the State, OSEP required the State to provide documentation with its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the State ensures compliance with the requirement that when hearing officers grant extensions of the 45-day timeline for issuing final decisions in due process hearings, they specify either the length of the extension or the new date by which the hearing officer must mail the decision to the parties (34 CFR §300.515(a) and (c)). The State provided documentation of revised procedures regarding due process hearing timelines, and of scheduled training for Administrative Law Judges. The State reported that no due process hearing where an extension has been requested and granted has occurred subsequent to the Verification Visit. Instead, the State</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p> <p>In OSEP's November 3, 2008 Verification Visit letter to the State, OSEP required the State to provide documentation with its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the State ensures compliance with the requirement that when hearing officers grant extensions of the 45-day timeline for issuing final decisions in due process</p>

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>submitted one order from FFY 2007 and one order from FFY 2008 that it held out as containing sample language for hearing officers to use in granting extensions. One of the two orders did not specify either the length of the extension or the new date by which the hearing officer must mail the decision to the parties.</p>	<p>hearings, they specify either the length of the extension or the new date by which the hearing officer must mail the decision to the parties (34 CFR §300.515(a) and (c)). The State did not provide sufficient documentation to show compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.515(a) and (c)).</p> <p>By November 17, 2009, the State must submit to OSEP documentation that the State ensures compliance with the requirement that when hearing officers grant extensions of the 45-day timeline for issuing final decisions in due process hearings, they specify either the length of the extension or the new date by which the hearing officer must mail the decision to the parties. The State's documentation must include, but is not limited to: (1) evidence of training and/or guidance provided to hearing officers regarding proper extensions of the 45-day timeline; and (2) all due process hearing Orders of Continuance/Notices of Continued Hearing and Orders Extending Deadlines, or other such documentation that grant an extension of the due process hearing timelines, issued between November 3, 2008 and November 2, 2009.</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 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 50%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 47%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 60-70%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Georgia Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 58.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 56.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 60-70%.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>