

**Pennsylvania 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) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 82.5%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</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) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 12.2%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 12.75%.</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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator for grade span 3-5 are 79.95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 75.25%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 met its FFY 2008 target of 75.48%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator for grade span 6-8 are 75.95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 69.43%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 69.25%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator for grade span 9-12 are 43 districts, or 30.71%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 50 districts, or 34.48%. The State met its FFY 2008 target to increase the proportion of districts that achieve AYP in grade span 9-12 by an additional 10% of the baseline number for 2004-05, to 39.</p>	<p>improve performance.</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 98.6% for reading and 98.8% 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 met its FFY 2008 targets of 95.7%.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at <a href="http://paayp.emetric.net">http://paayp.emetric.net</a>.</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</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 32.7% for reading and 38.9% 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 63% for reading and 56% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at <a href="http://paayp.emetric.net">http://paayp.emetric.net</a>.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.6%. 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</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

**Pennsylvania 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>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>comment on whether there is progress or slippage. 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>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 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>OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, that the uncorrected 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. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or 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</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>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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 Indicator; 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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 748 1467 1219"> <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>53</td> <td>55.3</td> <td>57</td> <td>2.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>11.1</td> <td>10.8</td> <td>10.2</td> <td>0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.4</td> <td>4.37</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>0.03%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for Indicator 5C is 4.2%. However, the State's FFY 2008 data under IDEA section 618 for Indicator 5C are 4.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet 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	53	55.3	57	2.30%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.1	10.8	10.2	0.30%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.4	4.37	3.7	0.03%	<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	53	55.3	57	2.30%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.1	10.8	10.2	0.30%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.4	4.37	3.7	0.03%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</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</p>																				

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps									
<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 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 in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 865 1444 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 865 919 984">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 865 1192 984"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 865 1444 984"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 984 919 1118"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 984 1192 1118">70.8</td> <td data-bbox="1192 984 1444 1118">55.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1118 919 1286"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1118 1192 1286">72.9</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1118 1444 1286">47.2</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) (%)	70.8	55.0	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	72.9	47.2	<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) (%)	70.8	55.0									
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	72.9	47.2									

<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.

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	70.8	56.8	
<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 targets for this indicator in its SPP 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 2008 reported data for preschool age children under this indicator are 84.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 baseline data of 83.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 84.2%.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for school age children under this indicator are 34.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 34%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 34.13%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response groups were representative of the population.</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 2009 APR.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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>

**Pennsylvania 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>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance 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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 112 of 113 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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 initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007 was corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on 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 FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEA with one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007: (1) are 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) have 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>[Compliance 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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six 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 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>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 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>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all 121 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</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</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>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>school.                      B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.                      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>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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.9%. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,484 of 1,485 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR was corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, 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</p>

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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, 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) 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</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator 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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 88%. The State met its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

**Pennsylvania 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>or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, its review of 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. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 41%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 52%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 50-60%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 77%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 75-85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 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>