

Oklahoma 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 84.22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 82.89%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 90.28%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 7.25%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 4.22%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 5.95%.</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: 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 42.23% for reading and 50.00% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 85.21% for reading and 85.80% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 54% for reading and met its FFY 2007 target of 42% for math.</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>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</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 94.78% for reading and 98.99% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.22% for math. The FFY 2006 data for reading were 95.18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 95% for reading and met its FFY 2007 target of 95% for math.</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>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 58.57% for reading and 62.43% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 50.88% for reading and 53.22% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 52% for reading and 54% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 10.02%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were collected during FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.91%.</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 2007.</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 Chart, 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 greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race</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>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]																						
<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="550 480 1467 959"> <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>54.93</td> <td>59.12</td> <td>49.04</td> <td>4.19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>10.05</td> <td>9.89</td> <td>10.24</td> <td>0.16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>1.90</td> <td>1.47</td> <td>1.64</td> <td>0.43%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A, 5B and 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met all of its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54.93	59.12	49.04	4.19%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.05	9.89	10.24	0.16%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.90	1.47	1.64	0.43%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	54.93	59.12	49.04	4.19%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.05	9.89	10.24	0.16%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.90	1.47	1.64	0.43%																		
<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>																				

Oklahoma 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's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 297 1419 1047"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 297 1062 472">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 297 1182 472">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 297 1302 472">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 297 1419 472">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 472 1062 540">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 472 1182 540">2.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 472 1302 540">1.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 472 1419 540">1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 540 1062 675">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 540 1182 675">5.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 540 1302 675">5.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 540 1419 675">4.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 675 1062 776">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 675 1182 776">3.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 675 1302 776">3.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 675 1419 776">2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 776 1062 876">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 776 1182 876">8.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 776 1302 876">9.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 776 1419 876">9.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 876 1062 977">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 876 1182 977">80.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 876 1302 977">80.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 876 1419 977">81.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 977 1062 1047">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 977 1182 1047">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 977 1302 1047">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 977 1419 1047">100.00 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.1	1.9	1.8	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.2	5.1	4.4	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3.7	3.0	2.6	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8.7	9.8	9.3	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	80.3	80.2	81.9	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.1	1.9	1.8																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5.2	5.1	4.4																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	3.7	3.0	2.6																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8.7	9.8	9.3																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	80.3	80.2	81.9																											
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 90.82%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 86.83%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 85.50%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																												
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the</p>																												

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 0.56%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that three of three LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>	<p>requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>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 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.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.45%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 26 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely evaluation 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 requirements in 34</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p>
<p>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 91.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 86.97%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the 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 requirements; and (2) has developed and</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.81%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.67%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 18 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>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 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, 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77.88%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 86.97%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 87.97%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided improvement activities to address this issue.</p>	<p>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 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>The State reported that all 329 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator 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>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 four due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80%. The FFY 2006 data were 80%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 53.33%. The FFY 2006 data were 66.67%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 93.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 96.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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 and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.