

Pennsylvania 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 targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 86.52%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 84.48%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2007 target of 86.24%.</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 targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12.16%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 14.17%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2007 target of 12.75%.</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 targets for grade spans 3-5 and 6-8 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator for grade span 3-5 are 75.25% (298 districts). These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2007 target of 73.23%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for grade span 6-8 are 69.43% (293 districts). These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 68.4%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2007 target of 68.25%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for grade span 9-12 are 34.48% (50 districts). These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 39.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	The State met its FFY 2007 target of 36 school districts.	
<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 99.7% for reading and 99.8% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.3% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.6% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 95.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 31.1% for reading and 36.1% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 28.5% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 33.6% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 32.2% for math and did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 31.8% 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 improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.4%.</p> <p>The State further reported that 2.2% of districts suspended students with disabilities for more than ten days at a rate greater than four times the State baseline rate. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target that 0% of school districts would suspend students with disabilities for more than ten days at a rate greater than four times the State baseline rate.</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 noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected</p>

Pennsylvania 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 described how the State reviewed and 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>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p>	<p>noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.</p> <p>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 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>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>The State revised the targets for Indicators 5A and 5B and improvement activities for Indicator 5C and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-</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</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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>established targets.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 329 1467 870"> <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">49.7</td> <td align="center">53</td> <td align="center">53</td> <td align="center">3.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">12.4</td> <td align="center">11.1</td> <td align="center">11.3</td> <td align="center">1.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">4.2</td> <td align="center">4.4</td> <td align="center">3.9</td> <td align="center">-0.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for Indicators 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for Indicators 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.	49.7	53	53	3.30%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.4	11.1	11.3	1.30%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.2	4.4	3.9	-0.20%	<p>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.	49.7	53	53	3.30%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.4	11.1	11.3	1.30%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	4.2	4.4	3.9	-0.20%																		
<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>																				

Pennsylvania 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="548 293 1419 1240"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 293 1060 472">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 293 1180 472">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 293 1299 472">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 293 1419 472">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 472 1060 570">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 472 1180 570">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 472 1299 570">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 472 1419 570">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 570 1060 732">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 570 1180 732">24</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 570 1299 732">26</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 570 1419 732">21</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 732 1060 870">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 732 1180 870">22</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 732 1299 870">28</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 732 1419 870">23</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 870 1060 1000">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 870 1180 1000">23</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 870 1299 1000">26</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 870 1419 1000">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1000 1060 1138">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1000 1180 1138">30</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1000 1299 1138">19</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1000 1419 1138">31</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1138 1060 1240">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1138 1180 1240">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1138 1299 1240">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1138 1419 1240">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.	1	1	1	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	24	26	21	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22	28	23	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23	26	24	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30	19	31	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.	1	1	1																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	24	26	21																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22	28	23																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	23	26	24																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30	19	31																											
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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it has revised its process for collecting and analyzing preschool data that will be reported for this indicator in FFY 2008. The State has revised the preschool family survey and the methodology it will use to analyze the survey results. Beginning in FFY 2008, the State will report on</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																												

Pennsylvania 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]	<p>separate targets for preschool and school age children. The State recalculated its FFY 2005 baseline data and FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 progress data using the revised method of analysis and revised its targets accordingly, beginning with the FFY 2008 reporting period. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 34%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 35.12%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 36.52%.</p> <p>The State did not provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</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 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 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 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>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 93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight 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 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</p>

Pennsylvania 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 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 program 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 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 95.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that its two 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. 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</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implanted 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. [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 75.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 69%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 96 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. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA program 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 program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs,</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 66%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 66.1%.</p>	<p>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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 96%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 1239 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 2006 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 in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, 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 program 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>

Pennsylvania 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. [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%. 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. [Compliance 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 88%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. 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 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 52%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 33%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 50-60%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77%. The FFY 2006 data were 77.8%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 75-85%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 94.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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>