

New Hampshire 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 71.56%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed the way data were reported. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 75%.</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 looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.30%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 3.3%.</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 28%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 24.63%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 47%.</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 children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99% for reading and 98% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.71% for reading and 97.81% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 97% for both reading and math.</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>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 37% for reading and 31% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 reported data of 38.45% for reading and 33.96% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 70.40% for reading and 69.19% 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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.45%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because FFY 2010 was the first year of data based on the change in the definition of significant discrepancy developed in FFY 2009. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 2.8%.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that six 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 four out of 174 districts did not meet the minimum “n” size of 11 students with IEPs in the district and four students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than ten days.</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 it revised, (or required the affected districts to revise), 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
4. Rates of suspension and	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.0%. These data remain	OSEP appreciates the State’s

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
<p>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>unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that five districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 out of 174 districts did not meet the minimum “n” size of 11 children with IEPs in the district and at least four students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than ten days.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the district’s policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, 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 it did not revise (or required the affected districts to revise), 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, pursuant to 34 CFR § 300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>efforts regarding this indicator.</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>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1214 1612 1518"> <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">48.71</td> <td align="center">72.62</td> <td align="center">49</td> <td align="center">23.91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">19.18</td> <td align="center">8.56</td> <td align="center">18</td> <td align="center">10.62%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<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	48.71	72.62	49	23.91%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19.18	8.56	18	10.62%	<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	48.71	72.62	49	23.91%													
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	19.18	8.56	18	10.62%													

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="552 266 1614 435"> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 266 993 435">C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td data-bbox="993 266 1173 435">2.82</td> <td data-bbox="1173 266 1335 435">2.67</td> <td data-bbox="1335 266 1497 435">2.82</td> <td data-bbox="1497 266 1614 435">0.15%</td> </tr> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3. The State provided an explanation.</p>					C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.67	2.82	0.15%								
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2.82	2.67	2.82	0.15%														
<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 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>												
<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's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1117 1614 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="552 1117 970 1219"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="970 1117 1184 1219"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1184 1117 1398 1219"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1398 1117 1614 1219"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1219 970 1354">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="970 1219 1184 1354">66.3</td> <td data-bbox="1184 1219 1398 1354">69.6</td> <td data-bbox="1398 1219 1614 1354">66.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="552 1354 970 1521">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="970 1354 1184 1521">67.1</td> <td data-bbox="1184 1354 1398 1521">73</td> <td data-bbox="1398 1354 1614 1521">67.1</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) (%)	66.3	69.6	66.3	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	67.1	73	67.1	<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> <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) (%)	66.3	69.6	66.3															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	67.1	73	67.1															

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 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 (%)	68.5	68	68.5	
	<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) (%)	71.3	68.4	71.3	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	53.4	50.7	53.4	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	63.1	55.2	63.1	
The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of 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 50%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 47%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 35%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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.	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 four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that none of the districts was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

New Hampshire 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]	<p>inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported the 160 of 174 districts did not meet the minimum “n” size requirement of 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups, and within those subgroups at least ten students identified as receiving special education and related services.</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’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 two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that none of the districts was 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 the 160 of 174 districts did not meet the State established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 students enrolled in the district in two or more racial/ethnic subgroups, and within those subgroups at least ten students identified in the specific disability categories for the racial/ethnic subgroup being compared.</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 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 112 of 118 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</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 reflected in the FFY 2010 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in the FFY 2010 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 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 21 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for</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</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 data the State reported 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 the FFY 2010 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 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</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 50.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 47%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 19 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2010 data the State reported 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 the FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>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>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="550 630 1612 1172"> <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">43.2</td> <td align="center">54.4</td> <td align="center">43.2</td> <td align="center">11.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">70.2</td> <td align="center">75.7</td> <td align="center">70.2</td> <td align="center">5.50%</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">82.6</td> <td align="center">87.9</td> <td align="center">82.6</td> <td align="center">5.30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</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	43.2	54.4	43.2	11.20%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	70.2	75.7	70.2	5.50%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	82.6	87.9	82.6	5.30%	<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. % Enrolled in higher education	43.2	54.4	43.2	11.20%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	70.2	75.7	70.2	5.50%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	82.6	87.9	82.6	5.30%																		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.64%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 99.40%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 259 of 268 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating</p>																				

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>were corrected in a timely manner and that the 9 remaining findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012.</p>	<p>that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, 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, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 60%. 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>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, 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>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'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 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 71%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 69%. The State did not meet 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>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 60%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 82%. The State did not meet its</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011</p>

New Hampshire Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>FFY 2010 target of 85%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	APR.
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.86%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</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, 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>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>