Table A – New Hampshire Part B

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
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))	On page 2 of the SPP, the State used FFY 2003 data for baseline information in response to this indicator. Also on page 2, the State reported that data for FFY 2004 would not be available until "spring 2006."	The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.
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))	The State used FFY 2003 data for baseline information in response to this indicator. The State reported that baseline data for reporting statewide drop-out rates for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 would be available on February 1, 2006.	The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.
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))	An evaluation of the sampling plan for indicator 8 indicated that it was not technically sound (see OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum). Data will lack validity if based on a sampling plan that is not technically sound. OSEP is concerned because your plan is to use these invalid data to establish baseline data for this Indicator. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.	As indicated in the February 14, 2006 OSEP memorandum, if a revised sampling plan has not been accepted by OSEP by the time the State submits its FFY 2005 APR on February 1, 2007, the State must submit a revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State's FFY 2005 APR. In the FFY 2005 APR, you also need to explain how your State addressed the deficiencies in the data collection noted in the attachment to the OSEP memorandum. If you decide not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.
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.	The State provided incomplete baseline data in response to this indicator. The State did not include data in the SPP regarding the number of children referred from Part C to Part B who were determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility determinations were made prior to their	The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include these data will affect OSEP's

Table A – New Hampshire Part B

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))	third birthdays. The State initiated a new data collection system and will report complete baseline data in the State's FFY 2005 APR. However, on page 46 of the SPP, the State's data showed that only 237 of the 402 children (58.96%) served in Part C programs between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 had an IEP developed and implemented on or before their third birthdays. See Table B for a discussion of this noncompliance.	determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.