

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}) \text{ divided by the (total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State)}] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = $[(e) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent = $[(b + c + d + e) \text{ divided by } (a)].$

- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = $[(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = $[(c) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = $[(d) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100).
Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.
Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e) divided by (a)].

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level

nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | |
|------------------------------------|--|

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2010 (2010-2011)</p> | |
|------------------------------------|--|

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b – d)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|-------------|--|
| (2010-2011) | |
|-------------|--|

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

| | |
|-------------|--|
| (2010-2011) | |
|-------------|--|

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | |

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ State

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 2009 (2009-2010) | |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: