

Pennsylvania 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 86.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 84.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 82.5%.</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).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>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 10.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 11.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 9.91%.</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 for grade span 3-5 are 80.34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 75.48%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 80.0%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator for grade span 6-8 are 73.58%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 85.54%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 70.25%.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator for grade span 9-12 are for 79 districts, or 49.38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 90 districts, or 57.0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target to increase the proportion of districts that achieve AYP in grade span 9-12 by an additional 10% of the baseline number for 2004-05 to 46.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.56% for reading and 98.73% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.55% for reading and 98.51% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 96%.</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.</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 42.0% for reading and 46.7% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 35.3% for reading and 45.7% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 73% for reading and 67% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP 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 2.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of no more than 1.0% of the school districts in the Commonwealth (n=5 of 500) will suspend students with disabilities for more than 10 days at a rate greater than 3 times the statewide baseline rate of 0.78% .</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 17 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 26 of 500 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 10 students suspended or expelled greater than 10 days.</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>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</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 monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
	timely manner.	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>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 revised its methodology for calculating significant discrepancy for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP is unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its methodology for this indicator. 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 16 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 reported that it reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that 63 of 629 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 40 children with disabilities enrolled.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.															
<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>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1252 1583 1507"> <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">57.80</td> <td align="center">61.00</td> <td align="center">65.00</td> <td align="center">3.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less</td> <td align="center">10.50</td> <td align="center">9.60</td> <td align="center">8.00</td> <td align="center">0.90%</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	57.80	61.00	65.00	3.20%	B. % Inside the regular class less	10.50	9.60	8.00	0.90%	OSEP 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	57.80	61.00	65.00	3.20%													
B. % Inside the regular class less	10.50	9.60	8.00	0.90%													

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>than 40% of the day</p>					
	<p>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</p>	<p align="center">4.30</p>	<p align="center">4.30</p>	<p align="center">3.30</p>	<p align="center">0.00%</p>	
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>					
<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>					<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>
	<p align="center"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></p>		
	<p>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	<p align="center">70.09</p>	<p align="center">77.90</p>	<p align="center">71.30</p>		
	<p>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>	<p align="center">69.08</p>	<p align="center">76.70</p>	<p align="center">73.40</p>		

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	69.06	74.60	71.30	
	<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) (%)	54.93	57.80	55.50	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.55	48.20	47.70	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	57.56	58.00	57.30	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met 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 preschool age children under this indicator are 87.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 86.2%. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for school age children under this indicator are 39.31%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 34.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 35.65%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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.	The State revised its methodology and criteria to identify the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP is unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its methodology for				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Pennsylvania 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]	<p>this indicator. The State met its target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that one district was 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 91 LEAs (7 school districts and 84 charter schools) of 643 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 40 children with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 5, 2012 letter to John Tommasini required the State to include in its FFY 2010 APR its revised methodology for addressing Indicators 9 and 10. The State provided the required information.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its methodology and criteria to identify the number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its methodology for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that one district was 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 91 LEAs (7 school districts and 84 charter schools) of 643 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of at least 40 children with disabilities in a racial or ethnic category.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 5, 2012 letter to John Tommasini required the State to include in its FFY 2010 APR its revised methodology for addressing Indicators 9 and 10. The State provided the required information.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.
11. Percent of children who were	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent	OSEP appreciates the State’s

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 96.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five preschool findings of noncompliance and 27 of 33 school age findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the six remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>As stated in OSEP’s August 11, 2011 and January 27, 2012 letters to the State, the documentation submitted by PDE and OCDEL on June 8, 2011 and PDE on November 17, 2011 and OCDEL on November 18, 2011 met all of the required actions identified in OSEP’s March 14, 2011 verification visit letter, and no further action is required regarding the findings in that letter.</p>	<p>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 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>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<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 to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>As stated in OSEP's August 11, 2011 and January 27, 2012 letters to the State, the documentation submitted by PDE and OCDEL on June 8, 2011 and PDE on November 17, 2011 and OCDEL on November 18, 2011 met all of the required actions identified in OSEP's March 14, 2011 verification visit letter, and no further action is required regarding the findings in that letter.</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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(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 §300.124(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</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 to ensure compliance.</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>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 81.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 76.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 238 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</p>

Pennsylvania 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]		<p>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>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 to ensure compliance.</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>The State revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1049 1583 1521"> <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">28</td> <td align="center">31</td> <td align="center">28.1</td> <td align="center">3.17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">49</td> <td align="center">64</td> <td align="center">49.1</td> <td align="center">14.88%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or</td> <td align="center">66</td> <td align="center">74</td> <td align="center">66</td> <td align="center">7.72%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	28	31	28.1	3.17%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	49	64	49.1	14.88%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or	66	74	66	7.72%	<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	28	31	28.1	3.17%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	49	64	49.1	14.88%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or	66	74	66	7.72%																		

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	competitively employed					
<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 99.5%. The FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 1240 of 1246 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the six remaining findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>As stated in OSEP's August 11, 2011 and January 27, 2012 letters to the State, the documentation submitted by PDE and OCDEL on June 8, 2011 and PDE on November 17, 2011 and OCDEL on November 18, 2011 met all of the required actions identified in OSEP's March 14, 2011 verification visit letter, and no further action is required regarding the findings in that letter.</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</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12, 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 represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. 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>As stated in OSEP's August 11, 2011 and January 27, 2012 letters to the State, the documentation submitted by PDE and OCDEL on June 8, 2011 and PDE on November 17, 2011 and OCDEL on November 18, 2011 met all of the required actions identified in OSEP's March 14, 2011 verification visit letter, and no further action is required regarding the findings in that letter.</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</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>As stated in OSEP's August 11, 2011 and January 27, 2012 letters to the State, the documentation submitted by PDE and OCDEL on June 8, 2011 and PDE on November</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Pennsylvania Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
timelines. [Compliance Indicator]	17, 2011 and OCDEL on November 18, 2011 met all of the required actions identified in OSEP’s March 14, 2011 verification visit letter, and no further action is required regarding the findings in that letter.	
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 70%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50-60%. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 68%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 75-85%. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	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 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.