

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), 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, based upon the percentage of students with disabilities graduating, cannot be compared to the previously-established targets that were based upon the percentage of districts meeting or exceeding graduation benchmarks.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 60.2%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in the State's FFY 2007 APR and the State revised its measurement for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2007 target of 83%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP. The State explained the difference.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), 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, based upon the percentage of students with disabilities dropping out, cannot be compared to the previously-established targets that were based upon the percentage of districts meeting or exceeding dropout benchmarks.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 39.8%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR and the State revised its measurement for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2007 target of 23.6%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 38.70%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 24.85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 58%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 93.3% for reading and 92.2% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at: <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/staraccomsmods.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/staraccomsmods.asp</a></p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																			
<p>statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade-level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 332 1419 849"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Reading</td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unified, COE, HS 7-12</td> <td>24.19%</td> <td>29.8%</td> <td>45.0%</td> <td>27.66%</td> <td>31.6%</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elementary</td> <td>26.28%</td> <td>33.1%</td> <td>46.0%</td> <td>30.28%</td> <td>35.3%</td> <td>47.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS 9-12</td> <td>18.55%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>20.0%</td> <td>17.43%</td> <td>19.3%</td> <td>43.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for reading at the HS 9-12 range, and did not meet the other targets.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at: <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/staraccomsmods.asp">http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/sr/staraccomsmods.asp</a></p>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			Unified, COE, HS 7-12	24.19%	29.8%	45.0%	27.66%	31.6%	45.5%	Elementary	26.28%	33.1%	46.0%	30.28%	35.3%	47.5%	HS 9-12	18.55%	20.1%	20.0%	17.43%	19.3%	43.5%	<p>the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target																															
	Reading			Math																																	
Unified, COE, HS 7-12	24.19%	29.8%	45.0%	27.66%	31.6%	45.5%																															
Elementary	26.28%	33.1%	46.0%	30.28%	35.3%	47.5%																															
HS 9-12	18.55%	20.1%	20.0%	17.43%	19.3%	43.5%																															
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; 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 10.6%. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it required the affected LEAs to review the LEA’s</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>																																			

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>For the 95 districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2007 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 comply 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b); and whether practices in this area continue to comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP notes an apparent typographical error on pages 29-30, where the State reports that "... each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311..." because these provisions generally are referenced under Indicators 9 and 10 and relate to identification, not discipline.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required that, in its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State report consistent with the approved SPP and, based on FFY 2008 data, recalculate its threshold and determine the percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion of children with disabilities for greater than ten school days in a school year using the revised threshold. The State confirmed that it had done this.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 849 1467 1357"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>52.35</td> <td>51.6</td> <td>62</td> <td>-0.75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>22.62</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>18</td> <td>0.12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.48</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>-0.02%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5B and slippage for 5A. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52.35	51.6	62	-0.75%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	22.62	22.5	18	0.12%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.48	4.5	4.0	-0.02%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52.35	51.6	62	-0.75%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	22.62	22.5	18	0.12%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.48	4.5	4.0	-0.02%																		

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>						
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>						
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 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 measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2008 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 948 1444 1247"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 948 919 1065">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 948 1192 1065"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 948 1444 1065"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1065 919 1247"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1065 1192 1247">72.2</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1065 1444 1247">81.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	72.2	81.6	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>						
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	72.2	81.6						

<sup>1</sup> Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	69.5	82	
	<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	74.5	78.5	
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 84.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 83.6%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 82%. In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 5%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that 61 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that 42 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation. The State reported that all 52 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and 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</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 14.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 61 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 42 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR,</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation. The State reported that 140 of 142 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories 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, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 87.58%. These data</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,243 of 1,337 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 94 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010. OSEP notes an apparent typographical error on page 65, reporting that, "... the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance."</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92.57%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 80.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 167 of its findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]	FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. OSEP notes an apparent typographical error on page 70, reporting that, "... the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance."	<p>noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,832 of 1,857 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that all remaining findings subsequently were corrected in 2008-2009.</p>	In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009–2010. Targets must remain 100%.

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 147 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007,</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.99%. The FFY 2007 data were 98.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 32,607 of 33,287 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and 533 of 680 remaining findings subsequently were corrected. The State reported that one of three remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the continuing noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP notes an apparent typographical error on page 76, where the State reports that “...each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311...” as these provisions generally are referenced under Indicators 9 and 10, relating to identification.</p>	<p>and the remaining two findings identified in FFY 2006, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system, 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. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 17 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
<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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 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 adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator. The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 26%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 40%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 67%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the</p>

**California Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 74%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 75%.</p>	<p>State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 97.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, 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 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>