

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 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 revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 75.81%. Because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator, OSEP was unable to determine progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 77%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma in the SPP. The State reported that the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular diploma are different than for youth without an IEP. The State explained the difference.</p> <p>The State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator. The State explained that FFY 2007 data are the most recent data that the State has reported to the Department as part of its CSPR.</p> <p>The State also reported section 618 data of 94.11% for FFY 2008.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.28%. Because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator, OSEP was unable to determine progress or slippage, or whether or not the State met its target.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs in the APR.</p> <p>The State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR under the ESEA. In its APR submitted</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator. The State explained that FFY 2007 data are the most recent data that the State has reported to the Department as part of its CSPP.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 16.67%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether or not the State met its target, because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.59% for reading and 98.02% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/AS08AR_Rev.pdf and http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/Public%20Reporting%20Merged.pdf.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 24.99% for reading and 38.29% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of</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 2009 APR.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>32.40% for reading and did meet its FFY 2008 target of 38.10% for math.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results at http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/AS08AR_Rev.pdf and http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/Public%20Reporting%20Merged.pdf.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator is 11.76% Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State reported that it, as required by OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table, reviewed the LEA’s 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 and FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s 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 LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFYs 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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; New]</p>																						
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 883 1467 1352"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>51.8</td> <td>52.15</td> <td>54.29</td> <td>0.35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>12.65</td> <td>13.16</td> <td>12.52</td> <td>-0.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>2.76</td> <td>2.82</td> <td>2.57</td> <td>-0.06%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A from the FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	51.8	52.15	54.29	0.35%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.65	13.16	12.52	-0.51%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.76	2.82	2.57	-0.06%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	51.8	52.15	54.29	0.35%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.65	13.16	12.52	-0.51%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.76	2.82	2.57	-0.06%																		

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps						
<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 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that states must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and revised improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 997 1444 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 997 919 1117">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 997 1192 1117"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 997 1444 1117"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1117 919 1245">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1117 1192 1245">89.56</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1117 1444 1245">68.61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.56	68.61	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²						
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.56	68.61						

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	89.64	59.74	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	91.68	77.81	
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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 90.92% for early childhood and 95.12% for school age. This represents progress from the FFY 2007 data of 87.64% for early childhood and 94.43% for school age. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 86% for early childhood and 94.50% for school age for this indicator. OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to indicate in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State indicated that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2008 APR the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.			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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%. The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
10. Percent of districts with	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 98.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97.69%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 55 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 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 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 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 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 99.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that each of its two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. The State also reported that all of the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, 2005, and 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 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 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported 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 was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2009 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 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all 31 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 759 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified in FFY 2007.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (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 2009 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</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2008 APR documentation in response to the required actions listed in the verification visit letter of February 13, 2009, under Critical Element GS 1 and GS 2. The State submitted responsive documentation.</p> <p>OSEP acknowledged this documentation in a letter dated February 26, 2010, but noted that “a determination of whether or not ADE has corrected all of the noncompliance identified in our letter in GS1 and GS2 cannot be completed without a full review of the FFY 2008 APR.” After a review of the documentation submitted by the State and the FFY 2008 APR, OSEP concludes that, with one exception all of the outstanding findings from GS1 and GS2 have been satisfactorily corrected.</p> <p>However, OSEP cannot determine, based on the documentation provided and the APR, whether the State is utilizing all available information to make findings of noncompliance, including its statewide database used to collect information on APR compliance indicators. Although the State submitted, as required, a “Plan for</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identifying and correcting Noncompliance across Data Sources”, this plan does not provide sufficient information for OSEP to determine if the State has corrected the noncompliance identified in GS1 of the verification letter.</p> <p>Within 60 days of the issuance of this response table, the State must submit documentation of the specific procedures it uses to make findings based on noncompliance identified through the statewide database. This must include information on the steps taken from the time potential noncompliance is “flagged” by the database to the time a finding of noncompliance is made. The documentation must also include the criteria that are used to elevate a “red flag” to a finding of noncompliance.</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 revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 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>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to</p>

Arkansas Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 50%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 87.5%. Because the State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 53%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 91.66%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 75%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 73.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 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). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>