

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 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 compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 60.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 61%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 62.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, either the revised FFY 2004 baseline data using the revised measurement or maintain the FFY 2004 baseline data using the old measurement. The State reported in the FFY 2006 APR that it maintained the FFY 2004 baseline and that Arizona is reporting subsequent years' results using the cohort method.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 5.59%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 5.50%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 18.25%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 12.16%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 23.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97% for reading and 97% for math.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 29% for reading and 30.5% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 26.4% for reading and 26.9% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 40% for reading and 35% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 1.87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 2.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.55%.</p> <p>The State, under Indicator 15, reported that 39 of 40 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was corrected by June 30, 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified as having</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR, and the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. (The review for LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 APR may occur either during or after the FFY 2006 reporting period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR.) The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance, identified in FFY 2005 as a result of the review required under 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe 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 compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 711 1419 1089"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>50.5%</td> <td>52.3%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>17.2%</td> <td>16.2%</td> <td>16.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>2.6%</td> <td>2.7%</td> <td>2.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.5%	52.3%	50%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	17.2%	16.2%	16.5%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.6%	2.7%	2.5%	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	50.5%	52.3%	50%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	17.2%	16.2%	16.5%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	2.6%	2.7%	2.5%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
special education settings). [Results Indicator]																										
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 412 1419 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 412 1062 586">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 412 1182 586">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 412 1299 586">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 412 1419 586">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 586 1062 656">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 586 1182 656">16%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 586 1299 656">11%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 586 1419 656">17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 656 1062 792">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 656 1182 792">33%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 656 1299 792">28%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 656 1419 792">28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 792 1062 894">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 792 1182 894">22%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 792 1299 894">19%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 792 1419 894">19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 894 1062 997">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 894 1182 997">28%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 894 1299 997">41%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 894 1419 997">36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 997 1062 1097">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 997 1182 1097">1%</td> <td data-bbox="1182 997 1299 1097">1%</td> <td data-bbox="1299 997 1419 1097"><1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	16%	11%	17%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	28%	28%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22%	19%	19%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28%	41%	36%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1%	1%	<1%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, APR progress data and improvement activities.</p> <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	16%	11%	17%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	33%	28%	28%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	22%	19%	19%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	28%	41%	36%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	1%	1%	<1%																							
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	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 48.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 44.9%.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.																								

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 45%.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State submitted revised baseline data and revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP those revisions that are not inconsistent with 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.600(d)(3) and 300.646(b), as set out in the analysis.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 0 of 8 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 and 0 of 4 LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services was not the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) revision to its process including a clarification of whether the State is using the same definition of disproportionate representation in special education and significant disproportionality; (2) the appropriate data consistent with the instructions for this indicator; (3) for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, a description and report on the review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation in special education, both underidentification and overidentification, that is the result of inappropriate identification; (4) to the extent that charter school LEAs meet the State-established “n” size, charter schools as part of the State’s review for disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification; and (5) clarification that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the required information.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State reported that it is using the same definition for disproportionate representation as for significant disproportionality in the identification of children as children with disabilities. As set out below, the State’s description of its procedures for determining whether disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, in cases of determinations of significant disproportionality, the description for providing for the review of policies, procedures and practices is not fully consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.600(d)(3) and 300.646(b).</p> <p>In its revised SPP, the State reported that for districts identified with disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality, it “focuses on [district] practices” because compliant policies and procedures are required prior to eligibility for Part B funding. The State did not describe the process for, or frequency of, determinations of compliant policies and procedures for eligibility purposes, or of any review of whether the policies and procedures had changed. Also, the State reported that where it reviewed the practices in a district identified with disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality, and the district is identified in a subsequent year, the State will not engage in a subsequent investigation or</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>determination until a “regularly scheduled monitoring unless the pattern of disproportionality changes over time or the [district] modifies its identification procedures.” That is, the State does not look at whether practices changed since the previous review. These procedures are not consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173; 300.600(d)(3); and 300.646(b).</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must revise its procedures to ensure that it provides for the review of policies, procedures and practices consistent with 34 CFR §300.646(b) and a determination of whether any disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification consistent with 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.600(d)(3). The State’s procedures must, at a minimum, include a determination of whether those districts identified with disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services have changed their policies or procedures from the time when the district established eligibility under Part B with fully compliant policies and procedures. If there have been changes, the State must provide for a review of those changes for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311; and for a</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>determination of whether the district's practices are consistent with those requirements. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2005, that were determined to be in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality for FFY 2006, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and a review of district practices for compliance with those requirements.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions that are not inconsistent with 34 CFR §300.173, as set out in the analysis.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 3.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported 91.2% of the 10 LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) revision to its process including a clarification of whether the State is using the same definition of disproportionate representation and significant disproportionality; (2) the appropriate data consistent with the instructions for</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State did not report on any program-specific follow-up activities related to the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>this indicator; (3) for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, a description and report on the review of data and information for all race ethnicity categories in the State to determine if there is disproportionate representation by disability category, both underidentification and overidentification, that is the result of inappropriate identification by disability category; (4) to the extent that charter school LEAs meet the State-established “n” size, charter schools as part of the State’s review for disproportionate representation by disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification; and (5) clarification that it requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the required information, but the State’s description of its procedures is not fully consistent with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.173.</p> <p>In its description of its procedures under Indicator 10, the State referenced the same procedures described under Indicator 9. As noted under that indicator, in order to meet the requirements of Part B, the State must modify its procedures. Therefore, the same changes related to determinations and reviews of policies, procedures and practices required</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>under the analysis for Indicator 9, also would meet the requirements under Indicator 10 for determinations of disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 84%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 86%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 30 of 34 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and three of 34 were</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 the reporting on this indicator consistent with the instructions and using the required</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>corrected by June 30, 2007. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that the district “had their IDEA payments interrupted and was required to employ a special monitor with local funds.”</p>	<p>measurement. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 82.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 63.61%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although, the State reported 100% correction of findings related to this indicator under Indicator 15, under this indicator, the State reported that of the 87 districts with noncompliance in FFY 2005, “43 demonstrated 100% compliance with the In-by-3 requirement for FFY 2006.” OSEP could not determine if the State timely corrected prior findings of noncompliance related to this indicator (identified in FFY 2005) because the State reported in Indicator 12, that it “required the leadership of the PEAs to work with ESS personnel to review the ongoing status of transition timelines through file reviews and transition tracking systems. These reviews resulted in 25</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data consistent with the instructions, on the range of delays and the reasons for the delays. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>PEAs demonstrating compliance at the point-in-time of the site visit. Year-end data reporting will be reviewed to determine if these PEAs were able to sustain compliance for the entire school year. The remaining 19 PEAs were not able to demonstrate compliance or did not have data to evaluate.”</p> <p>The State further reported that, “PEAs that are unable to document compliance by the year-end data collection will be required to hire a special monitor with local funds to ensure that the barriers are overcome and practices result in appropriate transitions for children from AzEIP. Should the special monitor be unable to secure compliance, IDEA 619 funds will be interrupted by the ADE/ECE until such time as compliance has been achieved.”</p>	<p>this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 57.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 83.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that “[a]ll PEAs with uncorrected findings during the SY 2005-2006 school year demonstrated compliance on or before 6/30/07 with the exception of 1 PEA” which “is currently working with a special monitor to bring them into compliance.”</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		2006 APR.
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 71.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data and targets with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 93.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 92.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 2807 of 3014 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that an additional 152 findings were corrected by June 30, 2007. The State reported on specific additional actions taken with 11 districts "with FFY 2005 monitoring." Of the 11 districts, nine were "closed," one district was awaiting a special monitor report and one had a "[p]ermanent withholding of FFY 2006 [IDEA] funds."</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) data demonstrating timely correction of noncompliance identified prior to June 2005, including any remaining uncorrected noncompliance regarding the provision of psychological counseling services, child find for children birth through three, and the provision of ESY services; (2) data demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600; and (3) in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with (Part B) 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.4%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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 fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two adjudicated due process hearings.</p> <p>These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 57.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 60%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 73.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 82.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP noted in the FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table the State's reporting at Indicator 20, page 35 of the APR, that "the issue of PEAs [local education agencies] being able to amend the SAIS [student accountability information system] data for three years may impact the accuracy of the reported graduation and dropout statistics." That is, impact data for Indicators 1 and 2.</p> <p>The State reported in the FFY 2006 APR that the "State statute was changed in 2006 to limit the window for change to one year for upward revisions." The State did not address downward revisions. With the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, please provide a copy of the relevant statutory provision and clarification of whether downward revisions are allowed; the time period for such revisions; and the impact, if any, on the validity and reliability of such revisions on the State's data.</p>

Arizona Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>