PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

PART B INDICATOR 13 WORKSHEET				
Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
 Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. 	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	20	20	19
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.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	37	37	37
improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified 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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	4	4	4
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit,	52	81	81
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early	On-Site Visits, or Other			

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	13	22	22
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	11	11	11
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	4	4	4
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	2
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	49	2375	2375
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	6	8	8

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
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.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	17	64	64
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Complaints, Hearings Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	36	101	101
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other areas of noncompliance: Due Process	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	61	87	87
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	4	4	4
Other areas of noncompliance: Personnel Qualifications	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
Other areas of noncompliance: Charter Schools	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			2827	2826
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	99.96%