

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated in its FFY 2010 APR that it revised its baseline for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 75.76%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way the data was calculated. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</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>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the baseline for this indicator with its FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.06%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.66%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 4.2%.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.25%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 13.64%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 17.15%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.78% for reading and 98.61% for math. The FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 99.12% for reading and 98.61% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 31.49% for reading and 44.86% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 27.20% for reading and represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 42.56% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 45.22% for reading and 51.44% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.91%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress and slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 6.23%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 19 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>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, due on February 1, 2011, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress and slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that seven 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 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 any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 districts were excluded for identification because the child count did not exceed 40 students. Four districts were excluded for a particular race/ethnicity because the child count did not exceed ten students in a particular race/ethnicity. Furthermore, each district was excluded for different racial categories: Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan Native, Black, and Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, data based on the required measurement. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<p>assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and 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="550 597 1583 1073"> <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">53.10</td> <td align="center">53.87</td> <td align="center">59.77</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">12.49</td> <td align="center">12.42</td> <td align="center">12.51</td> <td align="center">0.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">2.82</td> <td align="center">2.8</td> <td align="center">2.56</td> <td align="center">0.02%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C.</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	53.10	53.87	59.77	0.77%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.49	12.42	12.51	0.07%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.8	2.56	0.02%	<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. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.10	53.87	59.77	0.77%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.49	12.42	12.51	0.07%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.8	2.56	0.02%																		
<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</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 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>																																
facility. [Results Indicator; New]																																		
7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 513 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 513 957 613"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 513 1163 613"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 513 1373 613"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 513 1583 613"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 613 957 748"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 613 1163 748">89.68</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 613 1373 748">89.61</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 613 1583 748">90.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 748 957 919"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 748 1163 919">91.34</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 748 1373 919">90.31</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 748 1583 919">90.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 919 957 1024"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 919 1163 1024">90.32</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 919 1373 1024">90.82</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 919 1583 1024">92.50</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1024 957 1122"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1024 1163 1122"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1024 1373 1122"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1024 1583 1122"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1122 957 1256"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1122 1163 1256">66.74</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1122 1373 1256">66.58</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1122 1583 1256">69.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1256 957 1427"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1256 1163 1427">57.67</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1256 1373 1427">57.43</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1256 1583 1427">60.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1427 957 1490"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1427 1163 1490">76.23</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1427 1373 1490">76.69</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1427 1583 1490">78.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.68	89.61	90.50	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	91.34	90.31	90.50	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	90.32	90.82	92.50	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	66.74	66.58	69.50	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	57.67	57.43	60.50	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	76.23	76.69	78.50	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.68	89.61	90.50																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	91.34	90.31	90.50																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	90.32	90.82	92.50																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	66.74	66.58	69.50																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	57.67	57.43	60.50																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	76.23	76.69	78.50																															

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 266 1583 302"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 266 957 302">meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 266 1163 302"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 266 1373 302"></td> <td data-bbox="1373 266 1583 302"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="548 321 1556 383">These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>	meet their needs (%)				
meet their needs (%)						
<p data-bbox="92 418 516 618">8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p data-bbox="92 638 312 667">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 418 1556 483">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 503 1556 667">The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 90.47% for early childhood and 95.05% for school age. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 84.92% for early childhood and 93.56% for school age. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 88% for early childhood and did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 96% for school age.</p> <p data-bbox="548 686 1556 850">In its description of its FFY 2010 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 2010 APR the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.</p> <p data-bbox="548 870 1556 1000">OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, required the State to report in the FFY 2010 APR 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. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 418 2003 618">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> <p data-bbox="1612 638 2003 935">The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 1036 495 1235">9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1255 365 1284">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 1036 1556 1101">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1120 1556 1219">The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its methodology for reporting on this indicator. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1239 1556 1403">The State reported that three 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 data-bbox="548 1422 1362 1451">The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p data-bbox="548 1471 1556 1500">The State reported that 18 of 275 districts did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 1036 1976 1101">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>“n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities enrolled.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 5, 2012 letter to Martha Kay Asti required the State to include in its FFY 2010 APR its revised race-neutral methodology for addressing Indicator 9 to align with the State’s methodology for calculating Indicator 10. The State provided the required information.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 31 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 18 of 275 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities enrolled.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 53 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. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.21%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.14%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this</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 early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	indicator was corrected in a timely manner.	<p>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. 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 §300.124(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 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>
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012	OSEP appreciates the State's

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.19%. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator were 96.34%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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%</p>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		compliance in the FFY 2011 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and 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="548 597 1583 1107"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">12.86</td> <td align="center">14.54</td> <td align="center">13</td> <td align="center">1.68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">48.55</td> <td align="center">49.52</td> <td align="center">49</td> <td align="center">0.97%</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">59.34</td> <td align="center">61.05</td> <td align="center">60</td> <td align="center">1.71%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	12.86	14.54	13	1.68%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	48.55	49.52	49	0.97%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	59.34	61.05	60	1.71%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	12.86	14.54	13	1.68%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	48.55	49.52	49	0.97%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	59.34	61.05	60	1.71%																		
<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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and 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 remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</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</p>																				

**Arkansas 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]	The State reported that all 408 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.	<p>of noncompliance identified in 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>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2010, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2010, are 100%. These data are based on four 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2010, are 76.67%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 55%.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2010, are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 88.24%. 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>

**Arkansas Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and 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 96.51%. 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 §§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.</p>