

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 61%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 reported data of 57.2%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of "90% or improve."</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.43%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 reported data of 3.62%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 3.95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the target for FFY 2010 for this indicator and provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target for FFY 2010 and the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The revised FFY 2010 target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 9.38%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99% for reading and 99% for math. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 99% for reading and for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 98%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>																																																																
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 646 1583 1057"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>45.9%</td> <td>49.16%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>46.35%</td> <td>47.43%</td> <td>79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>48.09%</td> <td>47.93%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>39.69%</td> <td>44.56%</td> <td>78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>41.97%</td> <td>44.50%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>37.58%</td> <td>43.83%</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>47.32%</td> <td>45.30%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>35.49%</td> <td>34.12%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>34.80%</td> <td>38.94%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>22.76%</td> <td>25.94%</td> <td>66%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>27.97%</td> <td>25.80%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>30.42%</td> <td>37.78%</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>32.61%</td> <td>32.92%</td> <td>89%</td> <td>38.62%</td> <td>37.14%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	45.9%	49.16%	85%	46.35%	47.43%	79%	4	48.09%	47.93%	82%	39.69%	44.56%	78%	5	41.97%	44.50%	85%	37.58%	43.83%	77%	6	47.32%	45.30%	85%	35.49%	34.12%	65%	7	34.80%	38.94%	79%	22.76%	25.94%	66%	8	27.97%	25.80%	67%	30.42%	37.78%	70%	HS	32.61%	32.92%	89%	38.62%	37.14%	82%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	45.9%	49.16%	85%	46.35%	47.43%	79%																																																											
4	48.09%	47.93%	82%	39.69%	44.56%	78%																																																											
5	41.97%	44.50%	85%	37.58%	43.83%	77%																																																											
6	47.32%	45.30%	85%	35.49%	34.12%	65%																																																											
7	34.80%	38.94%	79%	22.76%	25.94%	66%																																																											
8	27.97%	25.80%	67%	30.42%	37.78%	70%																																																											
HS	32.61%	32.92%	89%	38.62%	37.14%	82%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 6.06%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 6.87%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 10%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>The State reported that based on its calculations from all 132 LEAs, 24 of 132 LEAs exceeded its criteria rate and were determined to have a significant discrepancy. The State further reported that 16 of the 24 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “fewer than 10 children with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year” and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or 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]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that no districts were identified as having 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>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that based on its calculations from all 132 LEAs, 33 LEAs exceeded its criteria rate and were determined to have a significant discrepancy, and 25 of the 33 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “fewer than 10 children with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year in at least one racial or ethnic group” and were excluded from the calculation.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.																					
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 565 1583 1040"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">80.98</td> <td align="center">82.30</td> <td align="center">61.26</td> <td align="center">1.32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">5.98</td> <td align="center">6.12</td> <td align="center">6.80</td> <td align="center">-0.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.80</td> <td align="center">2.62</td> <td align="center">2.75</td> <td align="center">0.18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	80.98	82.30	61.26	1.32%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5.98	6.12	6.80	-0.14%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.80	2.62	2.75	0.18	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	80.98	82.30	61.26	1.32%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5.98	6.12	6.80	-0.14%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.80	2.62	2.75	0.18																		
<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>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																
[Results Indicator; New]																																		
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 545 1583 1425"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 545 999 646"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="999 545 1203 646"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1203 545 1407 646"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1407 545 1583 646"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 646 999 747">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 646 1203 747">85.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 646 1407 747">87</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 646 1583 747">84.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 747 999 883">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 747 1203 883">80.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 747 1407 883">80.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 747 1583 883">79.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 883 999 984">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 883 1203 984">85.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 883 1407 984">86.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 883 1583 984">84.7</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 984 999 1084"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="999 984 1203 1084"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1203 984 1407 1084"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1407 984 1583 1084"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1084 999 1185">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 1084 1203 1185">59.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1084 1407 1185">61.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 1084 1583 1185">59.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1185 999 1321">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 1185 1203 1321">29.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1185 1407 1321">31.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 1185 1583 1321">29.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1321 999 1422">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 1321 1203 1422">72.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1203 1321 1407 1422">74.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1407 1321 1583 1422">71.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	85.5	87	84.7	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	80.6	80.9	79.7	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	85.1	86.8	84.7	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.6	61.5	59.3	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	29.2	31.8	29.0	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.2	74.7	71.8	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	85.5	87	84.7																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	80.6	80.9	79.7																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	85.1	86.8	84.7																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.6	61.5	59.3																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	29.2	31.8	29.0																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72.2	74.7	71.8																															

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 74.48%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 84.22%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 88.9%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that seven of 132 LEAs met its criteria for overrepresentation and that three of the seven LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of fewer than ten students in a racial and ethnic group and were excluded from the calculation. The State also reported that 48 of 132 LEAs met its criteria for underrepresentation and that 39 of the 48 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of fewer than 40 students in a racial and ethnic group and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 114 districts were identified with disproportionate representation</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 104 of 132 LEAs met its criteria for overrepresentation and that 56 of the 104 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “more than ten students” and were excluded from the calculation. The State also reported that all 132 LEAs met its criteria for underrepresentation and that 27 of the 132 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “more than 100 students” and were excluded from the calculation.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 24, 2011 letter required that, with its response, during the SPP/APR clarification period to OSEP’s FFY 2009 Alabama Part B SPP/APR Status Table, the State must describe the extent to which it verified correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 under Indicator 11 in a manner consistent with the guidance in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). The State provided the required description.</p> <p>The State reported that all 40 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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 2010 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.8%. The State's FFY 2008 data were 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 FFY 2010 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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 99.93%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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 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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP</p>	<p>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <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>accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 13.77% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 45.41% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 63.48% 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>FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 2281 of 2337 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that 56 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance)</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 60%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 75%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 49%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 82.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 87.09%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 72.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.62%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>