

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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 81.42%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 reported data of 75.81%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 77%.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.66%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 reported data of 4.28%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 4.25%.</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 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 13.64%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 16.67%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 16.95%.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.12% for reading and</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>98.88% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.59% for reading and 98.02% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%.  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.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 27.20% for reading and 42.56% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 24.99% for reading and 38.29% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 38.81% for reading and 44.62% for math.  The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</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>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  [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 2012.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 7.86%. The State's reported FFY 2008 reported data were 11.76%. However, OSEP cannot determine whether the State's data for this indicator are valid and reliable. The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State appears to have used a comparison that is not consistent with the measurement, in that the State reported that it compared the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days for children with disabilities to the rate for all students within each LEA, rather than the rate for children with disabilities compared to the rate for nondisabled children. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine if there was progress or slippage, or if the State made its target.  The State reported that it does not use a minimum "n" size requirement.  The State reported that it reviewed the 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State identified noncompliance through this</p>	<p>The State did not provide data based on the required measurement. However, the State provided a plan to collect and report data based on the required measurement beginning with the FFY 2010 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR.  The State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEA 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 LEA identified with noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (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>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</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 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 0%. However, OSEP cannot determine whether the State’s data for this indicator are valid and reliable. The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.” The State appears to have used a comparison that is not consistent with the measurement, in that the State reported that it compared the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days for children with disabilities in each racial and ethnicity group to the rate for all students within each LEA, rather than the rate for children with disabilities compared to the rate for nondisabled children.</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified with a significant discrepancy, by</p>	<p>The State did not provide data based on the required measurement. However, the State provided a plan to collect and report data based on the required measurement beginning with the FFY 2010 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Arkansas 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, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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 with 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 that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the 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, 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>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>																				
<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 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 964 1583 1440"> <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">52.15</td> <td align="center">53.10</td> <td align="center">56.93</td> <td align="center">0.95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">13.16</td> <td align="center">12.49</td> <td align="center">12.51</td> <td align="center">0.67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.82</td> <td align="center">2.82</td> <td align="center">2.56</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY</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	52.15	53.10	56.93	0.95%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.16	12.49	12.51	0.67%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.82	2.56	0.00%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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	52.15	53.10	56.93	0.95%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.16	12.49	12.51	0.67%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.82	2.56	0.00%																		

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																
	2009 targets for 5A and 5C.																	
<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 2009 APR.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 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="550 966 1585 1469"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="550 966 961 1063"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="961 966 1165 1063"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1165 966 1375 1063"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1375 966 1585 1063"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1063 961 1198"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="961 1063 1165 1198">89.56</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1165 1063 1375 1198">89.68</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1375 1063 1585 1198">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1198 961 1372"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="961 1198 1165 1372">89.64</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1165 1198 1375 1372">91.34</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1375 1198 1585 1372">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="550 1372 961 1469"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="961 1372 1165 1469">91.68</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1165 1372 1375 1469">90.32</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1375 1372 1585 1469">92</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.56	89.68	90	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.64	91.34	90	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	91.68	90.32	92	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.56	89.68	90															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.64	91.34	90															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	91.68	90.32	92															

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	68.61	66.74	69	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	59.74	57.67	60	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	77.81	76.23	78	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.  [Results Indicator]	<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 84.92% for early childhood and 93.56% for school age. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 90.92% for early childhood and 95.12% for school age. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.</p>				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.  The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2010 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special	<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</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 46 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 eight of 261 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities enrolled and that the racial or ethnic group represents at least 5% of enrollment.</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>[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 32 districts were identified with disproportionate representation 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.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that eight of 261 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities enrolled and that the racial or ethnic group represents at least 5% of enrollment.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</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%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 50 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</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 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>
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.14%. The State's reported FFY 2008 data were 99.27%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>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 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>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<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 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 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 96.34%.</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 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,</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 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>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. 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 reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 12.86% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 48.55% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 59.34% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the 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</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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008.</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%. The State reported that all 312 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner.  OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to submit within 60 days of the issuance of the response table documentation of the specific procedures it uses to make findings based on noncompliance identified through the statewide database. The State provided all of the required information and the issue was closed in a letter from OSEP dated August 9, 2010.</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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) 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 reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.  In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR, 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</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’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<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 four 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 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 87.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 54%.</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 88.24%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 91.66%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 74%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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 96.67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 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 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 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>