

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006, FFY 2007, and FFY 2008 APRs. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 1, 2010.</p> <p><u>Verification Letter</u></p> <p>OSEP's May 26, 2010 verification letter required the State to provide within 60 days of that letter two assurances that affect the timely provision of Part C services in Arizona regarding the single-line-of-responsibility requirements in IDEA section 635(a)(10) and Arizona's Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD's) revised service authorization procedures. The State provided the required assurances and information on July 21, 2010, but, as discussed further below, the State's May 2, 2011 Special Conditions Progress Report data raises questions about the efficacy of DDD's revised procedures in ensuring the timely provision of Part C services.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions</u></p> <p>The timely service provision requirements of this indicator were the basis of OSEP's 2000 monitoring report, 2004 Compliance Agreement, and the subject of Special Conditions on Arizona's IDEA Part C grant since FFY 2008. Arizona's FFY 2010</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2004 was corrected. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>IDEA Part C grant included special conditions to ensure compliance by three early intervention service (EIS) programs, including the largest Part C EIS program (DDD) in Arizona's largest county, Maricopa County.</p> <p>The State's February 1, 2011 Special Conditions progress report provided updated data for this indicator from July through December 2009 for the three EIS programs as required. The State's final progress report of May 2, 2011 provided data demonstrating continued noncompliance with the requirements of this indicator for the one major EIS program (DDD) in Maricopa County with data demonstrating 52.2% compliance for the period January 1, - February 15, 2011. This longstanding noncompliance and very low level of compliance continues to raise concerns about Arizona's ability to implement the Part C program in the State and to provide needed services to eligible children. OSEP will continue to impose Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2011 grant letter to ensure compliance by DDD in Maricopa County with the timely service provision requirements of this indicator.</p>	<p>§§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 74%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 76%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 92%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship);</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 240 1581 1258"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 240 957 342"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 240 1163 342"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 240 1369 342"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1369 240 1581 342"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 342 957 480"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 342 1163 480">62</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 342 1369 480">65</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 342 1581 480">62</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 480 957 651"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 480 1163 651">71</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 480 1369 651">73</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 480 1581 651">71</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 651 957 753"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 651 1163 753">71</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 651 1369 753">75</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 651 1581 753">71</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 753 957 855"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="957 753 1163 855"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1163 753 1369 855"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1369 753 1581 855"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 855 957 993"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 855 1163 993">57</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 855 1369 993">64</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 855 1581 993">57</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 993 957 1164"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 993 1163 1164">49</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 993 1369 1164">57</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 993 1581 1164">49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1164 957 1258"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1164 1163 1258">52</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1164 1369 1258">56</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1369 1164 1581 1258">52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	62	65	62	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	71	73	71	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	71	75	71	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	57	64	57	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	49	57	49	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	52	56	52	<p>APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	62	65	62																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	71	73	71																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	71	75	71																															
<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	57	64	57																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	49	57	49																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	52	56	52																															
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 293 1583 667"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Know their rights (%)</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">91.5</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td align="center">94.7</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">91.5</td> <td align="center">-0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td align="center">96.7</td> <td align="center">96</td> <td align="center">91.5</td> <td align="center">-0.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data remain unchanged for 4A. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. Know their rights (%)	95	95	91.5	0.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	94.7	94	91.5	-0.70%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	96.7	96	91.5	-0.70%	
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. Know their rights (%)	95	95	91.5	0.00%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	94.7	94	91.5	-0.70%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	96.7	96	91.5	-0.70%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator are .53%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that not all eligible children were included in the 2009 child count taken on December 1, 2009. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data beginning with the FFY 2010 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2010 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>																				
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2010 APR,</p>																				

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 1.72%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State reported that not all eligible children were included in the 2009 child count taken on December 1, 2009. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State provided a plan to collect and report valid and reliable data beginning with the FFY 2010 APR. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2010 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was subsequently corrected by January 31, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that two of the three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006, FFY 2007, and FFY 2008 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 1, 2010.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions</u></p> <p>The 45-day timeline requirements of this indicator are the subject of Special Conditions on Arizona's FFY 2010 Part C grant. The State's February 1, 2011 Special Conditions progress report provides updated data for this indicator from July through December 2010 for three EIS programs, as required. The State's final 2011 Special Conditions progress report of May 2, 2011 provided updated data demonstrating 100% compliance for this indicator for the two remaining EIS programs. OSEP is lifting the Special</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2004 was corrected.</p> <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>Conditions on the 45-day timeline requirements and will confirm this also in the State's FFY 2011 grant letter.</p> <p><u>Verification Letter</u></p> <p>OSEP's May 26, 2010 verification letter required the State to provide within 60 days of that letter an assurance that affects the 45-day timeline requirement in Arizona regarding the qualified vendor process. The State provided the required assurance and information on July 21, 2010. However, as noted above under Indicator 1, OSEP is concerned about the impact of the qualified vendor process on the ability of the State to ensure the timely provision of Part C services in Maricopa County.</p>	<p>reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (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 conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(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 provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 82%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>9. General Supervision system (including monitoring complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 86%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 14 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the two remaining findings subsequently were corrected by January 31, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that two of the four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the one uncorrected FFY 2004 finding under Indicator 1 and the one FFY 2004 uncorrected finding under Indicator 7.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR were corrected.</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 2010 APR, demonstrating that the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>OSEP will review and respond separately in the State's FFY 2011 grant letter to the State's Special Conditions progress reports including the final progress report, due on May 2, 2011.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006, FFY 2007, and FFY 2008 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2009 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 1, 2010.</p>	<p>§303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three complaints</p>	<p>with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period. OSEP's May 26, 2010 verification letter required the State to provide data demonstrating compliance with the 30-day timeline requirements for resolving due process hearings. The State did not have any adjudicated due process hearing requests in FFY 2009.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.  The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections</p>

**Arizona Part C FFY 2009 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>616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>