

Oklahoma 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 82.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 81.74%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 67.8%.</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 3.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 3.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 5.19%.</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 85.2% for reading and 88.4% for math. These data represented progress from the FFY 2008 data of 72.68% for reading and 76.58% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 54% for reading and 59% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</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 95.7% for reading and 96.3% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 96.75% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Oklahoma 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]	and 98.03% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95%. The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.	
<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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 56.74% for reading and 63.8% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 52.47% for reading and 58.10% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 60.93% for reading and met its FFY 2009 target of 62.13% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 8.85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 10.02%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 10.19%.</p> <p>On pages 15-16 of the SPP, the State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</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 though this review.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of 531 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</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)</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>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 47 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 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>The State reported that seven of 531 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1133 1583 1518"> <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">61.22</td> <td align="center">61.99</td> <td align="center">50.54</td> <td align="center">0.77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">9.72</td> <td align="center">9.79</td> <td align="center">9.94</td> <td align="center">-0.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or</td> <td align="center">1.34</td> <td align="center">1.42</td> <td align="center">1.85</td> <td align="center">-0.08%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<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	61.22	61.99	50.54	0.77%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.72	9.79	9.94	-0.07%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	1.34	1.42	1.85	-0.08%	<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	61.22	61.99	50.54	0.77%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.72	9.79	9.94	-0.07%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or	1.34	1.42	1.85	-0.08%																		

Oklahoma 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 FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1101 1583 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="552 1101 957 1203"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1101 1163 1203"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1101 1373 1203"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1101 1583 1203"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1203 957 1341">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1203 1163 1341">93.3</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1203 1373 1341">89.2</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1203 1583 1341">94.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1341 957 1505">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1341 1163 1505">92.8</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1341 1373 1505">89.1</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1341 1583 1505">93.84</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) (%)	93.3	89.2	94.78	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	92.8	89.1	93.84	<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) (%)	93.3	89.2	94.78														
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	92.8	89.1	93.84														

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	92.9	90.0	94.03	
	<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) (%)	54.5	57.6	57.44	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	55.0	55.7	56.49	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	67.7	69.7	68.25	
	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]	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 92.53%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 91.45%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 90%. 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.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities				OSEP appreciates the State's

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>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 118 of 531 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 531 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</p>	<p>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>[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 94 of 531 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 seven of 531 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten and were excluded from the calculation.</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>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 97.17%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.56%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the 49 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</p>

Oklahoma 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>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. 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>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 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>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		verify the correction.
<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 98.17%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.55%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 3, 2010 response table required that, when reporting on the correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with the remaining seven noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007, 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. The State reported on page 32 of the APR that "LEAs identified as in non compliance in ... FFY 2007 had a review of data to determine if compliance in this indicator was met under prong two of the 09-02 memorandum" and that "LEAs were provided the summarized data and were required to verify the accuracy of the data to determine if compliance in this indicator met prong two of the 09-02 memorandum." However, the State did not report on the outcome of the determination, i.e., that it verified that each LEA with the remaining seven noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007, is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator. 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining seven noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</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 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>§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>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</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.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 95.21%.</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. 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>When reporting on the correction</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>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>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were: A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. 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. The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are: A. 31.42% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; B. 46.45% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and C. 73.50 % 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>

Oklahoma 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.</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>The State reported that all 691 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008.</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 findings of 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.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>

Oklahoma Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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>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 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>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 73.33%. These data represent</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Oklahoma 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]	slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 85%.	
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [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 66.67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 85%.</p>	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	<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 target of 100%.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.