

Washington 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 69.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 69%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 68%.</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 6.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 6%.</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 baseline and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.01%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State used a different "n" size for the FFY 2007 AYP calculations. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 9.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Washington 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 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:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 500 1419 786"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-5</td> <td>37.29%</td> <td>34.30%</td> <td>76.1%</td> <td>31.14%</td> <td>28.97%</td> <td>64.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-8</td> <td>22.24%</td> <td>18.19%</td> <td>65.1%</td> <td>14.20%</td> <td>10.99%</td> <td>58.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>37.46%</td> <td>37.31%</td> <td>74.3%</td> <td>13.89%</td> <td>8.84%</td> <td>62.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3-5	37.29%	34.30%	76.1%	31.14%	28.97%	64.9%	6-8	22.24%	18.19%	65.1%	14.20%	10.99%	58.7%	10	37.46%	37.31%	74.3%	13.89%	8.84%	62.4%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
3-5	37.29%	34.30%	76.1%	31.14%	28.97%	64.9%																															
6-8	22.24%	18.19%	65.1%	14.20%	10.99%	58.7%																															
10	37.46%	37.31%	74.3%	13.89%	8.84%	62.4%																															
<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 targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 8.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 14%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 8.1%.</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 State's review of the data from 2007 and describe the review of policies, procedures and practices for the LEA identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, 2006, and 2007 as a result of its review of policies, procedures and practices, was corrected in a timely manner.</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). In addition, the State must again describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and</p>																																			

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 2005, 2006, and 2007.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 and 2006 data whose policies, procedures and practices were reviewed consistent with §300.170(b) in the prior year, the State reported on whether there were changes to the policies, procedures, and practices since the last review; if so, whether those changes complied with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continued to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, 2006, and 2007 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>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 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>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</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>	<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>

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	
	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.11	50.65	49.9	0.54%	
	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	13.46	14.05	14.31	-0.59%	
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.89	1.67	1	0.19%	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>					
<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>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.					The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due in February 1, 2010.

Washington 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="548 380 1419 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 380 1062 553">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 380 1182 553">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 380 1302 553">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1302 380 1419 553">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 553 1062 621">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 553 1182 621">1.63</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 553 1302 621">1.24</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 553 1419 621">1.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 621 1062 756">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 621 1182 756">16.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 621 1302 756">17.91</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 621 1419 756">13.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 756 1062 857">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 756 1182 857">33.67</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 756 1302 857">32.59</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 756 1419 857">18.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 857 1062 958">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 857 1182 958">26.53</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 857 1302 958">26.62</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 857 1419 958">27.86</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 958 1062 1058">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 958 1182 1058">21.78</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 958 1302 1058">21.64</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 958 1419 1058">38.06</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1058 1062 1133">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1058 1182 1133">100.01 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1058 1302 1133">100.00 %</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1302 1058 1419 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.	1.63	1.24	1.74	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16.4	17.91	13.81	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.67	32.59	18.53	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26.53	26.62	27.86	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	21.78	21.64	38.06	Total (approx. 100%)	100.01 %	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.	1.63	1.24	1.74																											
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16.4	17.91	13.81																											
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.67	32.59	18.53																											
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	26.53	26.62	27.86																											
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	21.78	21.64	38.06																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.01 %	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 26%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 24%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 25%.</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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY</p>																												

Washington 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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.34%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet 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 it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2006.</p>	<p>2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p>
<p>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 0.34%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	FFY 2006.	<p>compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 219 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>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 §300.301(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</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer with the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 71%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 110 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>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 §300.124(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 FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the</p>

Washington 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 reported data for this indicator are 75.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 33%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 39 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 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>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>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 reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of</p>

Washington 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 84%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 84%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 84%.</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>the State’s population. The State is addressing this issue by improving data collection and accuracy by upgrading its data collection method from paper to a web based collection system and using monitoring activities that include district self-studies and onsite system analysis visits by the State to verify the accuracy of LEA systems.</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 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 543 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, 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 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 93%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the complaint 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 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 slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</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 due process 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 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 42%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 19.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 22%.</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 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 78.5%. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator were 82%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 86%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 95.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 98%.</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 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>