

Texas Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 70%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way the data were calculated. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 70%.</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 appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 14.5%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way the data were calculated. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 12%.</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>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>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 70%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 42.18%. The State did not meet</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in</p>

Texas 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>its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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 its indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99% for reading and 99% 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% for reading and 95% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html</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 its indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 73% for reading and 64% 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 67% for reading and 58% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/index.html</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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>While the State also reported FFY 2008 data for this indicator, its FFY 2007 data for this indicator are 1.05%. Because the State's revised its methodology for calculating data for this indicator, 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 for FFY 2008.</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 revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</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>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 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</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 form 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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 its 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="550 431 1467 899"> <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>64.20</td> <td>67</td> <td>66</td> <td>2.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>12</td> <td>11</td> <td>-0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2007 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5B.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64.20	67	66	2.8%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.9	12	11	-0.1%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.20	1	1	0.2%	<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>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	64.20	67	66	2.8%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.9	12	11	-0.1%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.20	1	1	0.2%																		
<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>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>																				

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
[Results Indicator; New]														
<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 revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1444 1125"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 597 919 711">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 597 1192 711"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 597 1444 711"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 711 919 849">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 711 1192 849">73.4</td> <td data-bbox="1192 711 1444 849">62.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 849 919 1019">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 849 1192 1019">67.1</td> <td data-bbox="1192 849 1444 1019">52.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 919 1125">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1019 1192 1125">72.5</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1019 1444 1125">73.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	73.4	62.2	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	67.1	52.1	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.5	73.6	<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> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	73.4	62.2												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	67.1	52.1												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.5	73.6												
<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</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 75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 72.4%. The State met its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>												

¹ 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.

² 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.

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2008 target of 75%. In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that 14 districts that were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no 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.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. 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. [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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that five districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no 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.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. 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 its measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 94.19%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 89.19%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it did not identify any noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007. The State reported FFY 2007 actual target data of 89.19% for this indicator for the FFY 2007 APR, and that it made 364 findings of noncompliance based on those data in FFY 2008.</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 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 each LEA with the 364 findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2007 data: (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 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.</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</p>	<p>The State revised its measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data</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).</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 77%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State explained in the narrative under Indicator 12 in its FFY 2008 APR when accounting for children included in a, but not included in b, c, d, or e that some of the reasons for delay were child unavailable for scheduled assessments, parent scheduling issues, late transition planning meetings, and district scheduling and staffing issues.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State reported that it did not identify any noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007. The State reported FFY 2007 actual target data of 77% for this indicator for the FFY 2007 APR, and that it made 246 findings of noncompliance based on those data in FFY 2008.</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. 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 each LEA with the 246 findings of noncompliance based on the FFY 2007 data: (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>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are</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 of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 related to this indicator based on FFY 2006 data were timely corrected.</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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>However, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b); 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. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>2009 APR, that the remaining 14 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 based on FFY 2006 data were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 434 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were 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 remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(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 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>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</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>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 87%. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.76%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that it verified that each LEA with 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.</p> <p>The State reported that not all 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>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 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State 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>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and OSEP Memo 09-02 was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on the 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</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>In responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 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 indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and 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</p>	<p>The State revised its indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Texas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>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>\$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 29%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 29%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 30%.</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 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 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 78.35%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 80%.</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 95.23%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 83.9%. 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>