

North Dakota 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 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 73.08%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 79.57 %.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 71%.</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 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 16.69%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 13.88%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 12.95%.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 68.13% for reading and 85.63% for math.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 93.8% for reading and 98.2% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 96.5% for reading and 97.5% 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>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.6% for reading and 97.9% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91.3% for reading and 97.4% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 96.5% for reading and 97.5% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

North Dakota 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>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 53.6% for reading and 57.1% for math.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 61.2% for reading and 58.6% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 55% for math and did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 60% for reading.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 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 baseline, targets, and improvement activities and the calculation for significant discrepancy for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation for significant discrepancy.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of .97%.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</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 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>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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 in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 347 1455 898"> <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 align="center">77.83</td> <td align="center">77.68</td> <td align="center">79</td> <td align="center">-0.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">3.61</td> <td align="center">4.39</td> <td align="center">3.8</td> <td align="center">-0.78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">2.09</td> <td align="center">1.53</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">0.56%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5C from the FFY 2006 of 2.09% and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2006 data of 3.61%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5C and did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	77.83	77.68	79	-0.15%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	3.61	4.39	3.8	-0.78%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.09	1.53	2	0.56%	<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.	77.83	77.68	79	-0.15%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	3.61	4.39	3.8	-0.78%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.09	1.53	2	0.56%																		
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<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 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> <table border="1" data-bbox="634 347 1478 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="634 347 1047 521">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1047 347 1192 521">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1192 347 1337 521">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1337 347 1478 521">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 521 1047 586">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 521 1192 586">0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 521 1337 586">2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 521 1478 586">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 586 1047 724">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 586 1192 724">15</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 586 1337 724">15</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 586 1478 724">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 724 1047 862">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 724 1192 862">11</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 724 1337 862">11</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 724 1478 862">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 862 1047 1000">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 862 1192 1000">36</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 862 1337 1000">30</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 862 1478 1000">30</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 1000 1047 1097">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 1000 1192 1097">38</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1000 1337 1097">42</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 1000 1478 1097">47</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="634 1097 1047 1133">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1047 1097 1192 1133">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1192 1097 1337 1133">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1337 1097 1478 1133">100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0	2	0	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	15	15	17	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	11	11	6	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	36	30	30	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	38	42	47	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0	2	0																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	15	15	17																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	11	11	6																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	36	30	30																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	38	42	47																											
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 those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 88%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 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.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009: documentation that it had revised Appendix A (attached to the FFY 2006 APR) and the SPP, consistent with its descriptions under Indicators 9 and 10 of the FFY 2006 APR. The State revised the former Appendix A and attached the revised document, Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification, to the APR (Appendix C) and SPP (Appendix F). The State also described in its APR and SPP its revised procedures for determining disproportionality due to inappropriate identification. OSEP notes that the State reported, on page 41 of the revised FFY 2007 APR, that “the districts identified as having potential disproportionate representation were found to be in compliance based on appropriate identification of students requiring special education services.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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.</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 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.</p> <p>As noted above, OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009: documentation that it had revised Appendix A (attached to the FFY 2006 APR) and the SPP, consistent with its descriptions under Indicators 9 and 10 of the FFY 2006 APR. The State revised the former Appendix A and attached the revised document, Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification, to the APR (Appendix C) and SPP (Appendix F). The State also described in its APR and SPP its revised procedures for determining disproportionality due to inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</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 98.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.4%.</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 FFY 2005 noncompliance with timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State reported that all 186 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) 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 timely initial evaluations 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 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>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 95.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.09%.</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 FFY 2005 noncompliance was corrected. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State reported that all 21 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the 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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), 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 developed and implemented an 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>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 96.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 68.1%.</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 FFY 2005 noncompliance was corrected. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State reported that all 273 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>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. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 86.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 81.85%.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 100%. These data represent progress from FFY 2006 data of 70.27%.</p> <p>The State met 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 FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 noncompliance was corrected. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State reported that all 824 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</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>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 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 100%. These data are based on four complaints. 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>

North Dakota Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that zero of one mediation resulted in a settlement agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 91.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>