

**Oklahoma 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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 84.95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 82.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 82.4%.</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 2.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of &lt;4.81%.</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 86.8% for reading and 90.6% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85.2% for reading and 88.4% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 54% for reading and 59% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.72% for reading and 98.65% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.70% for reading and 96.30% 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>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 46.32% for reading and</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the</p>

**Oklahoma 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 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>49.63% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 56.74% for reading and 63.80% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 60.93% for reading and 71.60% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>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 10.30%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 8.85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 9.19%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 54 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 six of 522 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of “ten children on child count for each LEA.”</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 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>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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>These data are not valid and reliable because they are not consistent with the measurement for this indicator. The State reported the number of districts with 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, and reported the number of those districts having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data based on the measurement for this indicator. The State did not report that it conducted (or required the identified districts to conduct) the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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>implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. However, the State did not report that it reviewed, for the districts with 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, 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. The State reported on page 14 of the State’s final clarified APR that districts with significant discrepancies that were the result of inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices would be required to review policies, practices and procedures, consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b). However, on page 16 of that document the State reported that: (1) it required districts identified as discrepant to review only their policies, but did not report that it also reviewed or required review of those districts’ procedures and practices; and (2) required those districts to review their policies for “inappropriate identification,” and not for the three areas specified by the measurement for this indicator and 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that six of 522 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size of “10 children in child count at each LEA.”</p>	<p>to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). The failure to conduct the review required in 34 CFR §300.170(b) is noncompliance.</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report correction of this noncompliance by describing the review, and if appropriate, revision of 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 that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, for districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2009 discipline data, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>Further, in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 (using 2009-2010 data) and FFY 2011 (using 2010-2011 data) for this indicator.</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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="552 363 1583 839"> <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">61.99</td> <td align="center">62.37</td> <td align="center">51.04</td> <td align="center">0.38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">9.79</td> <td align="center">9.61</td> <td align="center">9.84</td> <td align="center">0.18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.42</td> <td align="center">1.40</td> <td align="center">1.85</td> <td align="center">0.02%</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>		<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	61.99	62.37	51.04	0.38%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.79	9.61	9.84	0.18%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.42	1.40	1.85	0.02%	<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	61.99	62.37	51.04	0.38%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9.79	9.61	9.84	0.18%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.42	1.40	1.85	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                      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>The State revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

**Oklahoma 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>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]</p>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>		
	<p><b>Outcome A:</b>                      Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>		89.0			
	<p><b>Outcome B:</b>                      Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>		88.5			
	<p><b>Outcome C:</b>                      Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>		90.1			
	<p align="center"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></p>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>		
	<p><b>Outcome A:</b>                      Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>		57.0			
	<p><b>Outcome B:</b>                      Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</p>		55.9			
	<p><b>Outcome C:</b>                      Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>		70.5			
	<p>The State provided revised baseline data using FFY 2010 data. Therefore, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2010 data to FFY 2009 data or FFY 2010 targets.</p>					

**Oklahoma 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>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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.53%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 84%.</p> <p>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>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>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</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 155 of 522 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that six of 522 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten "for child count at each LEA."</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State'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 353 of 522 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 six of 522 districts did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Oklahoma 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 ten “for child count at each LEA.”</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 96.10%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.17%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 115 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner, but that all 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 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 §300.301(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</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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.</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 97.10%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.17%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 28 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner, but that all were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</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 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 §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.70%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.21%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 241 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner but that all 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 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</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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>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 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>															
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1235 1583 1505"> <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">31.42</td> <td align="center">33.08</td> <td align="center">31.90</td> <td align="center">1.66%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively</td> <td align="center">46.45</td> <td align="center">57.14</td> <td align="center">46.90</td> <td align="center">10.69%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	31.42	33.08	31.90	1.66%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively	46.45	57.14	46.90	10.69%	<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	31.42	33.08	31.90	1.66%													
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively	46.45	57.14	46.90	10.69%													

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>employed</p> <p>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>	<p>73.50</p>	<p>91.23</p>	<p>73.50</p>	<p>17.73%</p>	
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the 963 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that all of these findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p>					<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State 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>In 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</p>

**Oklahoma 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>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>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 table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. However, OSEP's February 8, 2012 Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) letter found that the State does not have procedures in place and properly implemented to ensure that State complaints filed at the LEA level are investigated and a written decision issued consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.151 through 300.153. Accordingly, these data are not valid and reliable because they are not inclusive of State complaints filed at the LEA level. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State reported that it will provide valid and reliable data, which includes State level complaints filed at the LEA level for FFY 2010, in the FFY 2011 APR. In response to OSEP's February 8, 2012 CIV letter, the State provided a corrective action plan dated May 8, 2012, that included an assurance that it has revised its State complaint policies</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data that were inclusive of State complaints filed at the LEA level and the State must provide accurate data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Oklahoma 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>
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>and procedures to track the number of State complaints at the LEA level; the number of State complaints investigated at the LEA level; and the number of written decisions issued consistent with §34 CFR 300.151-300.153.</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's FFY 2010 reported for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. 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 38.89%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 73.33%. The State did not meet its 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>	<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 94.44%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 66.67%. The State met its FFY 2009 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>	<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%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.78%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</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>

**Oklahoma 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>
[Compliance Indicator]		timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). 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. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.