

Oregon 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 62.72%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 58.49%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 58%.</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 5.44%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 6.24%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 6.0%.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 26.67%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 11%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.53% for reading and 97.40% for math. These data represent progress in reading from the FFY 2006 data of 97.1% and progress in math from the FFY 2006 data of 96.86%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Oregon 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]		
<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 42.39% for reading and 40.41% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress in reading from the FFY 2006 data of 41.09% and progress in math from the FFY 2006 data of 34.88%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 60% for reading and 59% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 22.84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 19.29%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 17.29% (a decrease of 2%).</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, a description of the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). The State provided this information.</p> <p>In addition, the State was required to describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the three LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and for the 30 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006 on which the State did not report in the FFY 2006 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State did not report any findings of noncompliance related to these reviews.</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. In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 699 1467 1179"> <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">68.9</td> <td align="center">69.3</td> <td align="center">69.0</td> <td align="center">0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">11.0</td> <td align="center">11.0</td> <td align="center">11.0</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">1.9</td> <td align="center">1.7</td> <td align="center">2.2</td> <td align="center">0.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and remained unchanged for 5B 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.	68.9	69.3	69.0	0.40%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.0	11.0	11.0	0.00%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.9	1.7	2.2	0.20%	<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.	68.9	69.3	69.0	0.40%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.0	11.0	11.0	0.00%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.9	1.7	2.2	0.20%																		
<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>																				

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]																														
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 500 1419 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 500 1060 672">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 500 1180 672">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 500 1299 672">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 500 1419 672">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 672 1060 740">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 672 1180 740">16.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 672 1299 740">8.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 672 1419 740">5.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 740 1060 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="1060 740 1180 875">8.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 740 1299 875">8.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 740 1419 875">2.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 875 1060 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="1060 875 1180 979">18.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 875 1299 979">16.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 875 1419 979">10.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 979 1060 1083">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 979 1180 1083">2.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 979 1299 1083">2.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 979 1419 1083">8.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1083 1060 1182">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1083 1180 1182">54.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1083 1299 1182">64.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1083 1419 1182">73.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1182 1060 1245">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1182 1180 1245">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1182 1299 1245">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1182 1419 1245">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.	16.2	8.1	5.4	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	8.1	8.1	2.7	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	18.9	16.2	10.8	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	2.7	2.7	8.1	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	54.1	64.9	73.0	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	16.2	8.1	5.4																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	8.1	8.1	2.7																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	18.9	16.2	10.8																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	2.7	2.7	8.1																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	54.1	64.9	73.0																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %																											

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 preschool (ages 3-5) for this indicator are 46.93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 preschool data of 41%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 preschool target of 49%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported school-aged data for this indicator are 29%. The FFY 2006 data were 30%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 school-aged target of 31%.</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>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number (zero) of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State'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 (zero) of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is 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 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 94.83%. The FFY 2006 data were 95.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 108 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</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 and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently was corrected.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008</p>

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was fully corrected. The State provided this information.</p>	<p>APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory 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>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 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 requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.22%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 of 28 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by October 2008.</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 partially corrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected. The State provided this</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under</p>

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	information.	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>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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 72.56%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 69.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 74%.</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 99.14%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81.72%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,264 of 1,275 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 and specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in Indicators 11 and 13 under those indicators. The State reported that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 has been corrected and provided the required information in Indicators 11 and 13.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring</p>

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the correction of 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 96.77%. 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>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 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>The State reported no fully adjudicated 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>

Oregon Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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 60%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 28.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 28.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 80.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 86.5%.</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%. 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 and accurate data reporting requirements in 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>