

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 41.8%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 42.43%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 65%.  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 looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.  In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 4.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 3.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 3.6%.</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:  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 8.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 22.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 14%.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.4% for reading and 98.1% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.3% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:  C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.  [Results Indicator]	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 51.0% for reading and 31.1% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 49.6% for reading and slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 47.9% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 70%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:  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  [Results Indicator]	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 13.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 10.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 9.7%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 26 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 children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 155 of 197 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of more than three IDEA-eligible students with greater than ten days suspension/expulsion.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through a review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>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 Memorandum 09-02, dated 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>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]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 23 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. The State also reported that six districts were identified as having 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>The State reported that 167 of 197 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least five IDEA-eligible students with greater than ten days suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<p>districts' 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1032 1583 1455"> <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">70.1</td> <td align="center">70.8</td> <td align="center">70.0</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">10.6</td> <td align="center">10.7</td> <td align="center">10.8</td> <td align="center">-0.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital</td> <td align="center">1.6</td> <td align="center">1.5</td> <td align="center">2.0</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<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	70.1	70.8	70.0	0.70%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.6	10.7	10.8	-0.10%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital	1.6	1.5	2.0	0.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<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	70.1	70.8	70.0	0.70%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10.6	10.7	10.8	-0.10%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital	1.6	1.5	2.0	0.10%																		

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
	placements																
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>				<p>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.</p>												
<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="548 935 1583 1435"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 935 957 1036"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 935 1163 1036"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 935 1373 1036"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 935 1583 1036"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1036 957 1219"> <p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="957 1036 1163 1219">74.3</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1036 1373 1219">80.2</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1036 1583 1219">74.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1219 957 1435"> <p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="957 1219 1163 1435">60.5</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1219 1373 1435">54.3</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1219 1583 1435">60.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	74.3	80.2	74.3	<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	60.5	54.3	60.5	<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>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>														
<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	74.3	80.2	74.3														
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	60.5	54.3	60.5														

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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 (%)	44.8	43.5	44.8	
	<u><b>Summary Statement 2</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	32.5	29.0	32.5	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	23.6	21.3	23.6	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	31.7	29.2	31.7	
	The State's data for this indicator represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 39.6% for preschool-aged children (ages 3-5) and 33.4% for school-aged children. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 61% for preschool-aged children and progress from the FFY 2009 data of 28% for school-aged children. The State did not meet its targets of 66% for preschool-aged children and 41% for school-aged children.  In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>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 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.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 26 of 197 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category in special education.</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 49 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 26 of 197 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least ten IDEA eligible students in the same race/ethnicity category and disability category.</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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 361 of 369 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining eight findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2012.</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). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>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 §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 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>
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are	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	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%.</p>	<p>with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</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 81.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 77.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 140 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were 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; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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="548 695 1583 1333"> <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">24.18</td> <td align="center">25.3</td> <td align="center">25</td> <td align="center">1.12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">50.6</td> <td align="center">54.1</td> <td align="center">51</td> <td align="center">3.50%</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">66.04</td> <td align="center">67.7</td> <td align="center">67</td> <td align="center">1.66%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	24.18	25.3	25	1.12%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	50.6	54.1	51	3.50%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.04	67.7	67	1.66%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	24.18	25.3	25	1.12%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	50.6	54.1	51	3.50%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.04	67.7	67	1.66%																		

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>
	was representative of the population.	
<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 97.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1,476 of 1,511 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 35 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP’s verification letter dated February 1, 2011 required the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) to provide within 90 days of the date of the letter, a written assurance that it has taken the necessary steps to enable the State to identify noncompliance in a timely manner and provide written findings of noncompliance to LEAs as soon as possible after the State concludes that an LEA has noncompliance, generally in less than three months from discovery. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP’s verification letter dated February 1, 2011 also required ODE to submit with its FFY 2010 APR documentation demonstrating that it provided written findings of noncompliance to LEAs in a timely manner (i.e., “generally less than three months from discovery”), consistent with question 7 of OSEP’s September 3, 2008 FAQs. The State provided the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, 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. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 11, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. 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</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that the one resolution session did not result</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011</p>

**Oregon Part B FFY 2010 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>were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>in a settlement agreement. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 90.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 89.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 88%. 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%. OSEP has attached a copy of the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</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>