

Arizona 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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 64.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. 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.</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>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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 7.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.2%.</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 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 5.33%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 25%.</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:</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</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.6% for reading and 98.5% for math. These data represent progress from 97.6% for reading and represent progress from 97.5% for math from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</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:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 797 1583 1476"> <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></td> <td>36.3%</td> <td>62.6%</td> <td></td> <td>34.8%</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>34.1%</td> <td>56%</td> <td></td> <td>29.8%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>30.3%</td> <td>54.6%</td> <td></td> <td>24%</td> <td>44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>33.2%</td> <td>56%</td> <td></td> <td>19%</td> <td>43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td>31%</td> <td>59.2%</td> <td></td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td>26.7%</td> <td>54%</td> <td></td> <td>18%</td> <td>44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td></td> <td>31%</td> <td>48.6%</td> <td></td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>48%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<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		36.3%	62.6%		34.8%	53%	4		34.1%	56%		29.8%	50%	5		30.3%	54.6%		24%	44%	6		33.2%	56%		19%	43%	7		31%	59.2%		17.9%	44%	8		26.7%	54%		18%	44%	HS		31%	48.6%		16.9%	48%	<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		36.3%	62.6%		34.8%	53%																																																											
4		34.1%	56%		29.8%	50%																																																											
5		30.3%	54.6%		24%	44%																																																											
6		33.2%	56%		19%	43%																																																											
7		31%	59.2%		17.9%	44%																																																											
8		26.7%	54%		18%	44%																																																											
HS		31%	48.6%		16.9%	48%																																																											

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from 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>	
<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 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .51%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of .18%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.35%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 104 of 590 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</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 reported that LEAs had the “option to begin immediately revising their policies, procedures, and practices related to the discipline process and to correct all self-identified noncompliance” and that the State “specialists then interviewed the special education administrators and reviewed student files via on-site visits and/or desk audits to verify correction of instances of the self-identified noncompliance.” The State reported that it did not make any findings of noncompliance, but that based on the self-assessment it required each LEA “to revise its policies, procedures, and practices” and that the State specialists “conducted follow-up on-site visits and/or desk audits after the revisions to ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices complied with IDEA.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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</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 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</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</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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 reported that three 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 115 of 590 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</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>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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1117 1583 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>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">56.7</td> <td align="center">58.6</td> <td align="center">53</td> <td align="center">1.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">14.9</td> <td align="center">14.6</td> <td align="center">15</td> <td align="center">0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or</td> <td align="center">2.7</td> <td align="center">2.65</td> <td align="center">1.9</td> <td align="center">0.05%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.7	58.6	53	1.90%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.9	14.6	15	0.30%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	2.7	2.65	1.9	0.05%	<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</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	56.7	58.6	53	1.90%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.9	14.6	15	0.30%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	2.7	2.65	1.9	0.05%																		

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
	homebound/hospital placements																
<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 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="554 1149 1583 1494"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="554 1149 957 1252"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="963 1149 1163 1252"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1169 1149 1369 1252"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1375 1149 1583 1252"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1256 957 1435">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="963 1256 1163 1435">75.88</td> <td data-bbox="1169 1256 1369 1435">81.39</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1256 1583 1435">75.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="554 1440 957 1494">Outcome B:</td> <td data-bbox="963 1440 1163 1494">68.47</td> <td data-bbox="1169 1440 1369 1494">82.02</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1440 1583 1494">68.47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<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) (%)	75.88	81.39	75.88	Outcome B:	68.47	82.02	68.47	<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>
<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) (%)	75.88	81.39	75.88														
Outcome B:	68.47	82.02	68.47														

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)				
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	76.95	75.54	76.95	
	<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) (%)	59.30	70.13	59.30	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	47.36	69.76	47.36	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	57.50	61.85	57.50	
	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	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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 88%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 48%. In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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. [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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. 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%. The State reported that one district was 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. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that no districts were excluded from the calculations for disproportionate representation. The State reported that 186 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the application of the weighted risk ratio (WRR). The State indicated that it applied an alternate risk ratio (ARR) to review for disproportionate representation for districts that had more than ten students in an ethnic group of interest, but less than ten students in the comparable group. The State reported that it did not identify any of these districts as having disproportionate representation because “false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices,” and there is no indication that any district subjected to the ARR was required to review its policies, procedures and practices. The State reported that 185 of 186 districts that met the WRR criteria for disproportionate representation did not meet the additional State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and in the other racial/ethnic groups” and were excluded from review of policies, procedures and practices.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator 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 provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories consistent with the State definition. 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 no districts were excluded from the calculations for disproportionate representation. The State reported that 517 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services based on the application of the weighted risk ratio (WRR). The State indicated that it applied an alternate risk ratio (ARR) to review for disproportionate representation for districts that had more than ten students in an ethnic group of interest, but less than ten students in the comparable group. The State reported that it did not identify any district analyzed using the ARR as having disproportionate representation because “false positives were identified as a function of the small number rather than as a result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices,” and there is no indication that any district analyzed under the ARR was required to review its policies, procedures and practices.</p> <p>The State reported that 508 of 517 districts that met the WRR criteria for disproportionate representation did not meet the additional State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “30 or more students in the target racial/ethnic group and in the other racial/ethnic groups” and were excluded from review of policies, procedures and practices.</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</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR,</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 59 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>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 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 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</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight 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 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,</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 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</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 90%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State 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</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>§§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 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</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 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 13.8% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 48.4% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 70.6% 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>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 89.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13,162 of 13,888 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the 726 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</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) 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</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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, 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>[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 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>
<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 seven 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>

Arizona Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 44.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 83.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 70%.</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 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 85.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 70.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 84%.</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. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator 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>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>