

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 62.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 61%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of “90% or improve.”</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 2.43%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 3.45%.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 29.03%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 9.38%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 9.4%.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.6% for reading and 98.5% for math. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99% for reading and math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 98%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<p>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>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 266 674 337">Grade</th> <th data-bbox="674 266 821 337">FFY 2009 Data</th> <th data-bbox="821 266 968 337">FFY 2010 Data</th> <th data-bbox="968 266 1108 337">FFY 2010 Target</th> <th data-bbox="1108 266 1255 337">FFY 2009 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1255 266 1402 337">FFY 2010 Data</th> <th data-bbox="1402 266 1583 337">FFY 2010 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="821 337 1108 380">Reading</td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="1108 337 1583 380">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 380 674 422">3</td> <td data-bbox="674 380 821 422">49.16%</td> <td data-bbox="821 380 968 422">51.48%</td> <td data-bbox="968 380 1108 422">88%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 380 1255 422">47.43%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 380 1402 422">53.82%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 380 1583 422">84%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 422 674 464">4</td> <td data-bbox="674 422 821 464">47.93%</td> <td data-bbox="821 422 968 464">51.48%</td> <td data-bbox="968 422 1108 464">86%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 422 1255 464">44.56%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 422 1402 464">47.83%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 422 1583 464">83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 464 674 506">5</td> <td data-bbox="674 464 821 506">44.50%</td> <td data-bbox="821 464 968 506">50.94%</td> <td data-bbox="968 464 1108 506">88%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 464 1255 506">43.83%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 464 1402 506">55.85%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 464 1583 506">82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 506 674 548">6</td> <td data-bbox="674 506 821 548">45.30%</td> <td data-bbox="821 506 968 548">49.48%</td> <td data-bbox="968 506 1108 548">89%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 506 1255 548">34.12%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 506 1402 548">37.94%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 506 1583 548">74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 548 674 591">7</td> <td data-bbox="674 548 821 591">38.94%</td> <td data-bbox="821 548 968 591">43.26%</td> <td data-bbox="968 548 1108 591">84%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 548 1255 591">25.94%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 548 1402 591">29.32%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 548 1583 591">74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 591 674 633">8</td> <td data-bbox="674 591 821 633">25.80%</td> <td data-bbox="821 591 968 633">34.36%</td> <td data-bbox="968 591 1108 633">76%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 591 1255 633">37.78%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 591 1402 633">37.99%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 591 1583 633">78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 633 674 675">HS</td> <td data-bbox="674 633 821 675">32.92%</td> <td data-bbox="821 633 968 675">35.83%</td> <td data-bbox="968 633 1108 675">92%</td> <td data-bbox="1108 633 1255 675">37.14%</td> <td data-bbox="1255 633 1402 675">40.38%</td> <td data-bbox="1402 633 1583 675">86%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	Grade	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target		Reading			Math			3	49.16%	51.48%	88%	47.43%	53.82%	84%	4	47.93%	51.48%	86%	44.56%	47.83%	83%	5	44.50%	50.94%	88%	43.83%	55.85%	82%	6	45.30%	49.48%	89%	34.12%	37.94%	74%	7	38.94%	43.26%	84%	25.94%	29.32%	74%	8	25.80%	34.36%	76%	37.78%	37.99%	78%	HS	32.92%	35.83%	92%	37.14%	40.38%	86%	<p>State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	49.16%	51.48%	88%	47.43%	53.82%	84%																																																											
4	47.93%	51.48%	86%	44.56%	47.83%	83%																																																											
5	44.50%	50.94%	88%	43.83%	55.85%	82%																																																											
6	45.30%	49.48%	89%	34.12%	37.94%	74%																																																											
7	38.94%	43.26%	84%	25.94%	29.32%	74%																																																											
8	25.80%	34.36%	76%	37.78%	37.99%	78%																																																											
HS	32.92%	35.83%	92%	37.14%	40.38%	86%																																																											
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 6.09%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 8%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that three districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>																																																															

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that nine districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that five of 132 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of one.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</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; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 881 1583 1356"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">82.30</td> <td align="center">82.95</td> <td align="center">62.26</td> <td align="center">0.65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">6.12</td> <td align="center">6.19</td> <td align="center">6.70</td> <td align="center">-0.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.62</td> <td align="center">2.66</td> <td align="center">2.75</td> <td align="center">-0.04%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82.30	82.95	62.26	0.65%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.12	6.19	6.70	-0.07%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.62	2.66	2.75	-0.04%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82.30	82.95	62.26	0.65%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.12	6.19	6.70	-0.07%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.62	2.66	2.75	-0.04%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011</p>																				

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>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>baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 797 1583 1503"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">87</td> <td align="center">88.1</td> <td align="center">85.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">80.9</td> <td align="center">83.2</td> <td align="center">80.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">86.8</td> <td align="center">87.0</td> <td align="center">85.2</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</td> <td align="center">61.5</td> <td align="center">61.9</td> <td align="center">60.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	87	88.1	85.8	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	80.9	83.2	80.8	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.8	87.0	85.2	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	61.5	61.9	60.7	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	87	88.1	85.8																							
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	80.9	83.2	80.8																							
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.8	87.0	85.2																							
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	61.5	61.9	60.7																							

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	(%)				
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	31.8	34.9	32.4	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	74.7	74.3	72.3	
	The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator represent progress from the FFY 2009 data except for Summary Statement 2-Outcome C. The State met its FFY 2010 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 74.91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 74.48%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 89%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that 22 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. The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation." The State reported that 18 of 132 LEAs met its criteria for overrepresentation and that ten of those 18 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten students in a racial and ethnic group. The State also reported that 61 of 132 districts met its criteria for underrepresentation and that 47 of the 61 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of 40 students in a racial				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	and ethnic group.	
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 116 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 114 of 132 districts met its criteria for overrepresentation and that 59 of the 114 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “more than ten students.” The State also reported that all 132 districts met its criteria for underrepresentation and that 24 of the 132 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “more than 100 students.”</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 14 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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 2011 APR the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.87%. The FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 reported that all ten of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.																				
<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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 480 1583 1024"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">13.77</td> <td align="center">14.12</td> <td align="center">13.9</td> <td align="center">0.35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">45.41</td> <td align="center">42.78</td> <td align="center">45.6</td> <td align="center">-2.63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">63.48</td> <td align="center">53.86</td> <td align="center">63.8</td> <td align="center">-9.62%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 14A and slippage for 14B and 14C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 14A, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 14B and 14C.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	13.77	14.12	13.9	0.35%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45.41	42.78	45.6	-2.63%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	63.48	53.86	63.8	-9.62%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	13.77	14.12	13.9	0.35%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45.41	42.78	45.6	-2.63%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	63.48	53.86	63.8	-9.62%																		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised an improvement activity for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.6%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 231 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in</p>																				

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2011 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on three due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 17.14%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 60%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 49.5%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 84.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 82.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 75%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.62%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR</p>

Alabama Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		§§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.