

Montana Part B FFY 2010 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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 78.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 74.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 80%. 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).</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 3.4%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4.9%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 8.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 17.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 41.5%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.1% for reading and 96.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95% for reading and 95.9% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%. The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| <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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 50.7% for reading and 31.4% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 48.7% for reading and 30.1% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 33.5% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 33.5% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</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 2011 APR.</p> |
| <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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported that none of its districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “ten students with disabilities with multiple short-term suspensions or expulsions.” These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for “students with disabilities.”</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State reported that none of its districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “ten students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in a school year.” These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|------|------|------|--------|--|------|------|------|--------|--|------|-----|-----|-------|---|
| procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator] | The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="552 431 1583 906"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">51.3</td> <td align="center">51.1</td> <td align="center">52.0</td> <td align="center">-0.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">11.1</td> <td align="center">12.7</td> <td align="center">11.0</td> <td align="center">-1.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.85</td> <td align="center">1.3</td> <td align="center">1.5</td> <td align="center">0.55%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> These data represent progress for 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 5C and did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B for this indicator. | | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 51.3 | 51.1 | 52.0 | -0.20% | B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 11.1 | 12.7 | 11.0 | -1.60% | C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 1.85 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.55% | OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. |
| | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 51.3 | 51.1 | 52.0 | -0.20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 11.1 | 12.7 | 11.0 | -1.60% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements | 1.85 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.55% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New] | The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR. | The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|---|
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children age 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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 329 1583 1344"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">71.1</td> <td align="center">76.8</td> <td align="center">62.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">78.7</td> <td align="center">84.8</td> <td align="center">71.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">73.3</td> <td align="center">74.9</td> <td align="center">60.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">63.4</td> <td align="center">67.5</td> <td align="center">61.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">43.7</td> <td align="center">60.2</td> <td align="center">33.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">68.5</td> <td align="center">69.2</td> <td align="center">65.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 reported data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> | <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 71.1 | 76.8 | 62.5 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 78.7 | 84.8 | 71.0 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 73.3 | 74.9 | 60.0 | <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 63.4 | 67.5 | 61.0 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 43.7 | 60.2 | 33.0 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 68.5 | 69.2 | 65.0 | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 71.1 | 76.8 | 62.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 78.7 | 84.8 | 71.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 73.3 | 74.9 | 60.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 63.4 | 67.5 | 61.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 43.7 | 60.2 | 33.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 68.5 | 69.2 | 65.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>8. Percent of parents with a child</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 70.3%. These data represent</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|---|
| <p>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>slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 72.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 68%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that none of the districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 198 of 419 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “ten students for at least one racial and ethnic group.”</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> |
| <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 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.”</p> <p>The State reported that 198 of 419 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students “for at least one racial and ethnic group.”</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> |
| <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>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator have been corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). If the State does</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| [Compliance Indicator] | for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. | not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure correction. |
| <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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 82.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State reported that all 19 instances of noncompliance were timely corrected, and that, because the State verified correction within 90 days of identification of noncompliance, the State did not make findings of noncompliance.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 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 2011 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 51.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 85.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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;</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|---|------|------|------|-------|---|------|------|------|-------|---|
| | | <p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 829 1583 1373"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">26.6</td> <td align="center">24.8</td> <td align="center">27.0</td> <td align="center">-1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">72.0</td> <td align="center">72.1</td> <td align="center">73.0</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">85.4</td> <td align="center">85.4</td> <td align="center">86.0</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 14B, remain unchanged for 14C, and represent slippage for 14A from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> | | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | A. % Enrolled in higher education | 26.6 | 24.8 | 27.0 | -1.80% | B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 72.0 | 72.1 | 73.0 | 0.10% | C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 85.4 | 85.4 | 86.0 | 0.00% | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |
| | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2010 Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. % Enrolled in higher education | 26.6 | 24.8 | 27.0 | -1.80% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed | 72.0 | 72.1 | 73.0 | 0.10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed | 85.4 | 85.4 | 86.0 | 0.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>In reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 12 and 13 in the FFY</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|---|
| | | 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on five complaints. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> |

Montana Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that eight of nine mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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 FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> |