

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90.18%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 94.15%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 89%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.37%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 3.51%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 2.87%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 24% for reading and 41.18% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 6.45% for reading and 22.73% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 target for reading of 22.73% and did not meet its FFY 2007 target for math of 44.59%.</p>	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data are 99.02% for reading and 98.61% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.84%. The State met its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 19.95% for reading and 30.86% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 16.49% for reading and 24.81% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 25.99% for reading and 44.59% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 11.76%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 7.57%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 7.11%.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, required revisions to LEAs' discipline policies, procedures and practices, but did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p> <p>For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 (2006-2007) data, the State indicated that "[t]he review of affected districts' policy, procedures and practices did not identify noncompliance as the root cause for significant differences in discipline."</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State's failure to describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, required revisions to LEAs' 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, for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006 constitutes noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
		examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of the IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).															
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>															
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1084 1465 1425"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>51.05</td> <td>51.8</td> <td>51.49</td> <td>0.75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>12.02</td> <td>12.65</td> <td>12.52</td> <td>-0.63%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	51.05	51.8	51.49	0.75%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.02	12.65	12.52	-0.63%	<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress													
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	51.05	51.8	51.49	0.75%													
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	12.02	12.65	12.52	-0.63%													

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.68	2.76	2.57	-0.08%																				
<p>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).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>				<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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 FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 938 1419 1484"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 938 1062 1114">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 938 1178 1114">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 938 1293 1114">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1293 938 1419 1114">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1114 1062 1179">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1114 1178 1179">2.04</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1114 1293 1179">1.88</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1114 1419 1179">1.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1179 1062 1317">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1179 1178 1317">4.58</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1179 1293 1317">5.78</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1179 1419 1317">3.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1317 1062 1414">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1317 1178 1414">23.72</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1317 1293 1414">30.16</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1317 1419 1414">15.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1414 1062 1484">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1062 1414 1178 1484">36.18</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1178 1414 1293 1484">41.72</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1293 1414 1419 1484">37.59</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.04	1.88	1.78	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.58	5.78	3.24	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23.72	30.16	15.88	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	36.18	41.72	37.59	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																						
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	2.04	1.88	1.78																						
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.58	5.78	3.24																						
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	23.72	30.16	15.88																						
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	36.18	41.72	37.59																						

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same-aged peers.				
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	31.57	18.55	39.60	
	Total (approx. 100%)	98.09%	98.09%	98.09%	
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.64% for early childhood and 94.43% for school age. This represents progress for school age from the FFY 2006 data of 93.48%.</p> <p>The State met its early childhood FFY 2007 target of 85% and did not meet its school age FFY 2007 target of 94.50%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided strategies to address this issue.</p>				<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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. The State indicated that the incorporation of the family survey into the annual review process and parent teacher conferences should improve both response rates and the representativeness of the data. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.69%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 98.93%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 16 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has ensured that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, 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).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 97.38%. The FFY 2006 reported data were 97.58%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Both OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table and OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the subsequent APR, data that demonstrated compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124, including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005. The State submitted data demonstrating partial correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and 2005.</p> <p>The State reported that in 2006-07 and 2007-08, one program had noncompliance. However, the program has made gains, moving from a rate of 82.68% in 2005-06 to 96.81% in 2007-08. The State has worked with the program to provide training on the regulatory requirements, data collection and submission.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2004, 2005 and 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance is corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2006 and 2007 APRs.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has ensured that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 APRs: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.82%. These data</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 99.16%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has ensured that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 78.63%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 84.38%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84.40%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided strategies to address this issue.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State indicated that it "will continue activities to better prepare the data to ensure contact information is as up to date as possible. Activities will include (1) giving districts an additional opportunity to verify contact information and (2) the IDEA Data & Research Office will provide districts with a draft letter they can use to notify former students of the upcoming survey. These will provide opportunities to update contact information prior to sending</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		the final student list to LifeTrack Services, Inc. thus increasing the possibility of having valid contact information.”
<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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) ensured that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In the verification visit letter of February 13, 2009, under Critical Element GS 1, OSEP required the State to submit the following documentation with its FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010: 1) a written assurance that it has established procedures to carry out its monitoring responsibilities set forth under 34 CFR §300.600(a) and (b); 2) a plan ensuring that it uses all of its</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>components, including data the State receives through its monitoring system, statewide database, State complaints, and due process hearings, to timely identify and notify LEAs of noncompliance and the responsibility to ensure that all such noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case longer than one year after the date of notification; and 3) written documentation that it is fulfilling its obligations to monitor State agencies providing Part B services, including the Department of Disability Services. In addition, under GS 2, OSEP required the State to provide a written assurance that it has developed and is implementing procedures to ensure correction of all noncompliance that has been identified by all components of its general supervisory system, regardless of whether the noncompliance is systemic or an individual instance. OSEP looks forward to receiving the required documentation in the State's FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no fully adjudicated due process hearings were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that six of six resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State met its FFY 2007 target of 52%, although it is not required to meet its targets until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 75%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 80%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 73%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 of 98.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</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).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>