A R K A N S A S

D E P A R T M E N T   O F   E D U C A T I O N
S P E C I A L   E D U C A T I O N   U N I T

PART B
STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

2 0 0 5 – 2 0 1 0

Revised February 1, 2009

ARKANSAS
DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION

Dr. T. Kenneth James
Commissioner

State Board
Of Education

Randy Lawson
Bentonville
Chair

Dr. Naccaman Williams
Springdale
Vice Chair

Sherry Burrow
Jonesboro

Jim Cooper
Melbourne

Brenda Gullett
Fayetteville

Sam Ledbetter
Little Rock

Alice Mahony
El Dorado

Dr. Ben Mays
Clinton

Diane Tatum
Pine Bluff

February 1, 2009

U.S. Department of Education
ATTN: Janet Scire/Mail Stop 2600
7100 Old Landover Road
Landover, MD. 20785-1506

Dear Ms. Scire:

The State of Arkansas Department of Education herewith submits its Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) to the U.S. Department of Education for the Secretary's review in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b). Each Section of the Arkansas SPP and APR follows the format as established by the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

Arkansas will establish its determination criteria for the four levels of assistance and intervention regarding local education agencies (LEA) performance, apply determinations to the LEA and notify them by May 30, 2009 of their status. Individual LEA reports will be generated and posted to the special education website along with the SPP and APR.

We are appreciative of the efforts of OSEP, including the written comments on our most recent State Performance Plan, in providing guidance to the State as we worked to prepare a compliant SPP and APR. We look forward to the Secretary's review and approval of the Arkansas SPP and APR.

Respectfully,

Marcia Harding

Marcia Harding
Associate Director
Special Education

MH/jaf

Four Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR
72201-1019
(501) 682-4475
ArkansasEd.org

*An Equal Opportunity
Employer*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

The initial development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan (SPP) began in May 2005 with the appointment of a 40-member stakeholder group. This group consisted of consumers, parents, school officials, legislators, and other interested parties. Initial orientations to the SPP were provided to the stakeholders group as well as to the State Advisory Panel in June 2005.

In July 2005, a half-day working session was conducted for members of the stakeholder group and the State Advisory Panel. After a brief orientation, members were assigned to one of three task groups focusing on the establishment of measurable and rigorous targets, strategies for improving performance and steps necessary for obtaining broad-based public input. The recommendations and considerations generated by these task groups laid the foundation for the development of the Arkansas SPP.

After additional work to develop the content of the SPP around the 20 indicators, the SPP was presented to the State Advisory Panel in mid-October 2005 for its comments and modifications. Advisory Panel SPP changes were incorporated and presented to the 40-member stakeholder group in a series of conference calls in late October.

Further changes suggested by the stakeholder group were made in November 2005 while additional data and targets were assembled. The SPP was posted on the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education website as a series of program area "mini-volumes" in mid-November 2005. Comments were solicited from the public on the SPP topics of FAPE in the LRE, pre- and post-school outcomes, child find, and special education over-representation.

Changes made to the SPP since its original dissemination are presented to the stakeholder group and State Advisory Panel. The feedback provided by these groups will be incorporated into the SPP for subsequent submissions.

Following the submission of the Arkansas APR on February 1, 2009, the Arkansas Department of Education - Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) will utilize the ADE-SEU website as the primary vehicle for the annual dissemination of the APR on progress or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets. Additionally, e-version copies of the APR, along with an explanatory cover letter from the Arkansas Commissioner of Education, will be sent to the headquarters of each public library operating within the Arkansas public library system. Further, an official press release will be prepared and provided to all statewide media outlets detailing how the public may obtain or review a copy of the APR. Lastly, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will report annually to the public on each Local Education Agency's (LEA) performance against the SPP targets using the Special Education website as well as in an ongoing series of performance reports disseminated to statewide and local media outlets, primarily the print media.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 01: Graduation Rates

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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. (Explain calculation).

Special education students should receive support and services during their school careers that allow them to graduate from high school in numbers similar to other general education students in the district; thus, it is important to ensure that similar percentages of special education and general education students are graduating from high school in districts across the State.

In accordance with Arkansas Code Annotated §6-15-503, the calculated school enrollment census (October 1 through September 30) total is used to determine the graduation rate. The graduation rate for students in grades 9 through 12 is affected by the percentage of students enrolled during grades 9 through 12 and completing grade 12 without dropping out.

The benchmark for graduation is a three-year average difference between 12th grade district and special education graduation rates. The statewide three-year average for special education is 70.13%. The statewide three-year average for all students is 94.39%. A comparison of all students and 12th grade students' with disabilities graduation rates results in a 24.27% difference, with a standard deviation of 17.14%.

The trigger for this indicator is one standard deviation beyond the difference for the State, or the mean difference (24.27%) plus one standard deviation (17.14%) or 41.41%. Thus, any district that graduates 41.41% more of its 12th grade students than its 12th grade students with disabilities will be identified for monitoring on this indicator.

A four-year moving average was used to project graduation rates through 2011. A comparison between mean and median found no discernable difference; therefore, the mean was used to facilitate comparisons with past reporting. Variability in estimates is in part an artifact of historical data quality as well as the methodology. As data quality improves, more rigorous targets will be set.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

For the graduating classes of 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008, a minimum total of twenty-one (21) units must be earned by a student in order for the student to be entitled to graduate from an Arkansas public high school. These units, at a minimum, follow:

CORE -Fifteen (15) units
English – four (4) units
Oral Communications – one half (½) unit
Social Studies – three (3) units [one (1) unit of World History, one (1) unit of U. S. History, one half (½) unit of Civics or Government]
Mathematics -three (3) units [one (1) unit of Algebra or its equivalent and one (1) unit of Geometry or its equivalent. All math units must build on the base of algebra and geometry knowledge and skills.]
Science – three (3) units [at least one (1) unit of Biology or its equivalent and one (1) unit of a Physical Science]

Physical Education – one half (½) unit
Health and Safety – one half (½) unit
Fine Arts – one half (½) unit

CAREER FOCUS – Six (6) units
All units in the career focus requirement are established through guidance and counseling at the local school district based on the students' contemplated work aspirations. Career focus courses conform to local district policy and reflect state frameworks through course sequencing and career course concentrations where appropriate. Local school districts may require additional units for graduation beyond the fifteen (15) Core and the Career Focus units. These may be academic and/or technical areas. All core and career focus units must total at least twenty-one (21) units to graduate.

For the graduating classes of 2008-2009 and each graduating class thereafter, a minimum total of twenty-two (22) units shall be earned by a student in order for that student to be entitled to graduate from an Arkansas public high school. Specifically for the graduating class of 2008-2009, the required units at a minimum follow.

CORE - Sixteen (16) units
  English – four (4) units
  Oral Communications – one half (½) unit
  Social Studies – three (3) units [one (1) unit of World History, one (1) unit of U. S. History, one half (½) unit of Civics or Government]
  Mathematics -four (4) units [one (1) unit of Algebra or its equivalent and one (1) unit of Geometry or its equivalent. All math units must build on the base of algebra and geometry knowledge and skills.] Comparable concurrent credit college courses may be substituted where applicable.
  Science – three (3) units [at least one (1) unit of Biology or its equivalent and one (1) unit of a Physical Science]
  Physical Education – one half (½) unit
  Health and Safety – one half (½) unit
  Fine Arts – one half (½) unit

CAREER FOCUS – Six (6) units
All units in the career focus requirement will be established through guidance and counseling at the local school district based on the student's contemplated work aspirations. Career Focus courses will conform to local district policy and reflect state frameworks through course sequencing and career course concentrations where appropriate.

For the graduating classes of 2009-2010 and all graduating classes thereafter, the required twenty-two (22) units, at a minimum, shall be taken from the "Smart Core" curriculum or from the "Core Curriculum." All students will participate in the Smart Core curriculum unless the parent or guardian waives the student's right to participate. In such case of a waiver, the student will be required to participate in the Core. The required twenty-two (22) units, at a minimum, are to be taken from the Smart Core or Core as follows:

SMART CORE - Sixteen (16) units
  English - four (4) units - 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th
  Mathematics - four (4) units [All students must take a mathematics course in grade 11 or grade 12 and complete Algebra II.] Comparable concurrent credit college courses may be substituted where applicable.

Algebra I or Algebra A & B (Grades 7-8 or 8-9)
Geometry, Investigating Geometry or Geometry A & B (Grades 8-9 or 9-10)
Algebra II
Fourth math unit range of options: (choice of Transitions to College Math, Pre-Calculus, Calculus, Trigonometry, Statistics, Computer Math, Algebra III, or an Advanced Placement math)
Natural Science - three (3) units with lab experience chosen from Physical Science, Biology or Applied Biology/Chemistry, Chemistry, Physics or Principles of Technology I & II or PIC Physics
Social Studies - three (3) units
Civics or American Government
World History
American History
Oral Communications - one-half (½) unit
Physical Education - one-half (½) unit
Health and Safety - one-half (½) unit
Fine Arts - one-half (½) unit

CAREER FOCUS - Six (6) units
Local school districts may require additional units for graduation beyond the sixteen (16) Smart Core and the six (6) Career Focus units. These may be in academic and/or technical areas. All the Smart Core and Career Focus units must total at least twenty-two (22) units to graduate.

CORE - Sixteen (16) units
English - four (4) units
Oral Communications - one half (½) unit
Social Studies - three (3) units [one (1) unit of World History, one (1) unit of U. S. History, one half (½) unit of Civics or Government]
Mathematics - four (4) units [one (1) unit of Algebra or its equivalent and one (1) unit of Geometry or its equivalent. All math units must build on the base of algebra and geometry knowledge and skills.] Comparable concurrent credit college courses may be substituted where applicable.
Science - three (3) units [at least one (1) unit of Biology or its equivalent and one (1) unit of a Physical Science]
Physical Education - one-half (½) unit
Health and Safety - one-half (½) unit
Fine Arts - one-half (½) unit

A unit of credit shall be defined as the credit given for a course, which meets for a minimum of 120 clock hours. A minimum average six-hour day or minimum 30-hour week is required.

Beginning not later than age 16 or earlier if determined appropriate by a student's IEP Team, transition planning must be initiated to prepare a student for exit from a secondary education program to post-secondary life. This includes planning for the student's exit from school due to graduation. For a youth with an IEP, fulfillment of the requirements set forth in the student's IEP may constitute the basis for graduation from high school.

The graduation rate is tracked by the State for students in grades nine through twelve (9-12) to indicate the percentage of students enrolled during grades 9 through 12, and completing grade 12 without dropping out. The description of what constitutes a dropout is found in the description of Indicator 2.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews district graduation data via the Monitoring Profiles to ascertain a district's status with regard to graduation. Each district that triggers on the Monitoring Profiles is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about graduation, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)
In 2005, Arkansas school districts graduated 93% of 12th grade students. For youth with IEPs, the graduation rate with a regular diploma under Smart Core or Core was 88%.

The methodology used to identify districts for monitoring revealed that 91.54% of districts met or exceeded the State special education benchmark for graduation. Seven percent of districts fell between the State benchmark and trigger value indicating a risk for triggering in the future and two percent or six districts were identified for possible monitoring during 2005-06 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	The graduation rate for students receiving special education services has increased over the past four years by 40% from 63% in 2002 to 88% in 2005. During the same time reference, all 12th grade graduation rates have remained relatively constant with less than a 1 % change, from 92.7% in 2002 to 93.1% in 2005. The improvement reflects (1) the inclusiveness of a regular diploma-Smart Core and Core-for youth with and without disabilities; (2) the work of secondary transition specialists working with school districts to help keep youth with IEPs in school through student-driven transition planning; (3) better data collection methods and ongoing training with districts to address data submission protocols and data review; and (4) usage of the same methodology for calculating the graduation rate for youth with disabilities as for youth without disabilities. To identify school districts that are graduating a significant difference of students in general education than students receiving special education services, the ADE examined the 12th grade graduation rate for both groups. The data for this goal is retrieved from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The graduation rate is calculated by taking the number of youth with IEPs who graduated in a given year divided by the official 12th grade enrollment number of youth with IEPs, adjusted for transferring students. The same methodology is used to calculate the general education graduation rate. Districts may be triggered for monitoring if the difference between their special education and general education graduation rates is one standard deviation above the State's three-year average benchmark. In 2005-06 school districts triggered on graduation rate for possible monitoring during 2006.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Using a moving average based on the past four years (2002-2006) of data, Arkansas anticipates the percentage to remain steady over the next year at 88%. Additionally, it is anticipated that less than 2% of the school districts will trigger for monitoring.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	In 2006-07, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating will remain static at 88% (87.71%). States are no longer required to compare special education students to all students.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	In 2007-08, Arkansas expects the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating to rise slightly to 89%.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	In 2008-09, Arkansas expects the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating to remain at 89%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	In 2009-10, Arkansas expects the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating to hold steady at 89%.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	In 2010-11, Arkansas expects the percentage of youth with IEPs graduating to reach 90%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The State is mindful of the close interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. This interrelationship has been documented in prior State Annual Performance Reports (APRs) highlighting the ongoing emphasis on the general supervision continuous improvement monitoring system which focuses on specific school districts showing poor performance on graduation and dropout rate indicators and secondary grade benchmark assessment results. Prior APRs have also documented the ongoing development of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early Transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve post-school outcomes for youth with IEPs.

These activities are considered critical in meeting the improvement targets set in the SPP. These and other critical elements were identified in 2005-06 through the use of the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition (NASET) Self-Assessment Tool. State partners in secondary and postsecondary education established the Arkansas planning priorities prior to the National Center for Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) National Leadership Summit using this tool.

Of the five NASET quality indicators, three (schooling, career preparation, and connecting activities) were chosen by the Arkansas team as priorities for comprehensive planning. Within each of these three priorities, goals and action steps were developed to guide strategies during 2005-06. The three priorities identified are:

SCHOOLING: In order to perform at optimal levels in all educational settings, all youth need to participate in educational programs grounded in standards, clear performance expectations, and graduation exit options based upon meaningful, accurate, and relevant indicators of student learning and skills. Often this occurs without the input from agencies outside of education. Arkansas needs to include other agencies in its school planning to ensure the educational process provides: career and technical programs that are based on professional and industry standards; common performance measures; and individualized transition plans that lead to positive post-school outcomes.

CAREER PREPARATORY EXPERIENCES: Arkansas needs to bring together multi-agency programs to better serve youth with IEPs in the following areas: finding, formally requesting and securing appropriate supports and reasonable accommodations in education, training and employment settings; career assessments to help identify students' school and post-school preferences and interests; structured exposure to post-secondary educational and other life-long learning opportunities; exposure to career opportunity requirements including information about entry requirements, educational requirements, income and benefits potential and asset accumulation; and, improved job-seeking skills and basic work-place skills.

CONNECTING ACTIVITIES: Improve interagency collaboration through: exploration of additional ways to collaborate (e.g., joint training, data sharing, interagency transition conferences, and funding

coordination); development of a comprehensive plan for communication and the dissemination of transition information for youth with disabilities; expansion of training and technical assistance.

The State is using staff and resources of the National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth for additional technical assistance related to identifying needed planning partners centering on transportation, housing, and technology.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   In addition to developing school-centered strategies begun in 2005-06, the State intends to apply through the National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices for the Academy on Improving Outcomes for Young Adults with Disabilities. Through the Academy, substantial gaps and overlaps in agency programs, particularly in relation to service needs, services provided, and cross-agency performance standards will be addressed.

It is clear that youth with IEPs are underutilizing core services available in the state and that graduation and dropout indicators will improve if this can be effectively addressed. At the State level, Arkansas needs to identify and braid individual funding streams targeted to serving these youth. There is no blueprint to guide local areas that are ready, willing and able to begin co-locating and integrating services.

One of the products of this activity will be the development of a State Resource Map for identified agencies serving Arkansas youth between the ages of 14 and 30. For a student to graduate and to have a good experience in the world of work, the amount and type of preparation that leads to employment can make the difference between success and failure. The changing nature of the job market makes employment more difficult to obtain without specific skills. There are many resources available to students, teachers, counselors and transition coordinators to aid in the postsecondary and career planning process. The problem is that the resources lack integration and are often not user-friendly. Through the Academy, Arkansas hopes to create a comprehensive, integrated and self-directed tool for the student that interfaces aptitudes as determined from test scores and grades, interests, and skills with current Labor Market Information and Occupational Trends. By matching individual skills and aptitudes with career educational and skill requirements, youth with IEPs will identify realistic career goals, including entry into postsecondary educational settings.

The Secondary Transition Team will provide training on effective transition planning, person centered planning, how to write meaningful transition plans, assistive technology, and technical assistance opportunities; continue the Self-Determination in Arkansas project (SDAR); host the Transition Summit, local transition team meetings, and the Transition Institute; and participate in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum and College Bound Arkansas. In addition they will maintain the highschoolmatters.com website and assist in an update of the Arkansas Driver's License Study Guide to be posted at www.highschoolmatters.com.

Graduation from high school with a high school diploma begins with the first nine weeks of instruction during the 9th grade with subsequent credit earned during the first semester based upon the child's performance. Today all students are expected to graduate from high school. Yet, hundreds of thousands of students in the United States leave school early each year without a diploma (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Researchers have identified ninth grade as the most critical point to intervene and prevent students from losing motivation, failing and dropping out of school. According to the 2005-06 dropout data from the State's Student Information System (SIS), 1,018 ninth graders did not re-enroll for the 2006-07 school year.

Based on the present data, a longitudinal cohort of ninth graders will be established beginning with the 2007-08 school year and will be known as the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.)

project. C.O.R.E will include all public school districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and state-operated educational programs. Student performance data will be collected through the SIS in November 2007 for the identification of students failing one or more classes during the initial grading period. Districts, working with the P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams, will administer universal interventions (Response to Intervention) for a period of time not to exceed 10 weeks. A second student performance data collection will be conducted through the SIS on February 15, 2008 to identify students having failed the semester. Once students have been identified as failing the semester, districts will administer targeted interventions (Intervention Prevention) with additional individualized student-centered supports not to exceed 20 weeks. All interventions will be tracked to determine effectiveness to student performance. P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will coordinate interventions based upon disaggregated data.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008) State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities: Youth Development and Youth Leadership; and Family Involvement. An analysis of the self assessments will be conducted to provide strategies to address the localized needs of the students referred through CIRCUIT. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project.

Activities planned by the P.O.I.S.E Team for 2007-08 school year include:
- Launching the poised for graduation web domain http://www.poisedforgraduation.com.
- Launching the third awareness campaign through the P.O.I.S.E. website http://www.poisedforgraduation.com giving access to School districts, state level stakeholders, parents and youth to assist with effective resources and strategies for a successful academic school experience
- Brochures will be redistributed on a web-based access through http://www.archildfind.org/
- Providing evidence-based practices and information based upon researched areas of student competencies, further sub-grouped into a similar alignment with high school redesign via the P.O.I.S.E website (http://www.poisedforgraduation.com). Surveys will be conducted as needed via the ADE Special Education website survey link http://arksped.k12.ar.us/applications/Surveys/
- Facilitating Model teams in partnership with IDEA Data & Research will design the evaluation for C.O.R.E., the 9th grade data collection
- Providing regional workshops with evidence-based practices for districts that trigger during this reporting cycle
- Continuing partnerships with Alternative Education and Juvenile Detention programs, and with the new Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to provide information and training for teachers to make the most of interventions and resources to address the academic development and functional needs of the child

In addition to the activities stated above, the P.O.I.S.E. staff will engage in further activities contingent upon availability of funds and time.

Additional activities aimed at improving graduation rates will be conducted throughout the year by the secondary transition consultants, with an emphasis on local transition planning for low incidence populations and college bound students.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to

achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities strategies developed in 2005-06 and refined in the subsequent years. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide.

- Arkansas Transition Services will host and/or participate in various workshops including:
    - National DCDT Conference, "Brewing Best Practices in Transition," in Milwaukee, WI, October 16-17, 2008
    - 2008 DD Conference Presented by the DD Network, "Community - Together It's Better: Together Everyone Achieves More," Arlington Hotel, Hot Springs, AR., October 16-17, 2008
    - Tenth Annual Arkansas Conference for Parent Education and Parental Involvement, Hot Springs Convention Center, Hot Springs, AR., October 20-22, 2008
    - AR-DCDT Pre-Conference at AR-CEC in Hot Springs, AR; The KUDER Assessment, November 12, 2008
    - AR-CEC Conference, "Weaving Changes for the Future," Hot Springs Convention Center, November 13-14, 2008
- Arkansas Transition Services is collaborating with the Division on Career Development and Transition and KUDER to provide a pre-conference workshop on the KUDER Career Planning System at the Arkansas Council for Exceptional Children conference in November 2008. Approximately forty teachers will attend to learn about the assessment tool. Arkansas Transition Services will provide additional training on how to use the KUDER in the implementation of an effective transition plan.
- Transition Retreat. On December 10–11, 2008, teachers and Special Education Supervisors from three school districts will attend the first Transition Retreat at the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute. This retreat affords the schools the opportunity to learn about and get hands-on exposure to age appropriate Transition assessments, what they measure, the population they are appropriate for, guidelines for administration, etc. The teachers will be shown how the results of the reviewed assessments could be utilized in the development of a more productive and beneficial transition plan.
- Cadre meetings will be held at least quarterly to present team leaders with the latest information and professional development. A cadre meeting for leaders and co-leaders of local teams around the state will be held February 10-11, 2009 in Little Rock. This meeting will provide teams with professional development on self-determination from Tom Holub, who will present information to teachers on how to begin or continue implementation of self-determination in their classrooms. Information on indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 will be presented by NSTTAC consultants and teams will give input on planning for the October Summit. A second Cadre meeting is also being planned for June 2009. Professional development will again be provided to teams as well as an opportunity to update team plan progress and prepare for the October Summit.
- Transition Planning and Preparation for Students with Asperger's and High Functioning Autism Workshop. This workshop addressing Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) is scheduled for February 12, 2009. Special education teachers, supervisors and vocational rehabilitation counselors are invited

to attend this all day training. This presentation will guide participants to a better understanding of the issues related to transition to college for students on the Spectrum and introduce strategies to prepare, assess and work with this population. It will also provide strategies for students with Autism and Asperger's who are not planning to attend college. Participants will:

- o Understand the skills and preparation needed for students with ASD to transition to higher education settings
- o Learn how and when to begin preparing students on the Spectrum for the college option
- o Understand documentation requirements needed for ADA and Section 504 considerations at the post-secondary level
- o Learn how to help individuals with ASD gain insight into their disability and the ways in which it affects different areas of functioning in higher education settings
- o Become aware of alternative options for students with ASD for transition to college
- o Learn strategies to work with parents of ASD students and establish appropriate personal boundaries
- o Regional Transitions Class Trainings will be offered April 8, 2009

The P.O.I.S.E. staff and constituent teams will engage in a variety of activities to enhance graduation.

- Professional Development on Making Connection Among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 and utilization of this process in local school districts for requesting assistance through CIRCUIT.
- Technical Assistance (regional) for a network of local school districts that triggered in both indicator 1 and 2 to develop frameworks for school completion with the assistance of the Check and Connect Model
- Partnership with Arkansas Greater Graduation for Drop-out Prevention Summits to be held with local school districts statewide
- Partnership with High Schools that Work to implement 9th grade redesign statewide
- Parental Involvement: Pre-Transition age students will be provided unlimited access through radio broadcasts to receive information related to transition topics to increase their participation in schooling, career preparation, and workforce readiness
- Resource Partnership with Afterschool Network for youth at risk of dropping out of school prior to graduation
- Up-grade P.O.I.S.E. website to include drop-out prevention focus and parental involvement priorities
- Professional Development Presentation, "Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.)," by the P.O.I.S.E Coordinator at Special Show 2008

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be implemented statewide. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans.

Information on all the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.

Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be operational statewide. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 02: Dropout Rates
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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

In accordance with Arkansas Code Annotated §6-15-503, the calculated school enrollment census (October 1 through September 30) total is used to determine the dropout rate for all students. Dropouts include students who leave prior to graduation including students who pursue taking the General Educational Development test leading to a General Equivalency Diploma (GED).

The special education dropout benchmark of 1.55 % is the State three-year average difference between all students and students with IEPs. To establish the special education benchmark, 9-12 grade dropout rates are calculated for all students and special education students. The three-year average is 2.72 % and 4.27 % for students with IEPs and all students, respectively. The three-year difference has a standard deviation of 3.91 %.

To identify districts with youth with IEPs dropping out of high school at a greater rate than all youth in the district, a trigger value was established using the special education three-year average benchmark and standard deviation. Any district with a special education dropout rate 5.46 % higher than the rate for all students is identified for possible monitoring and must include a corrective action plan in the district's Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP).

To establish targets through FFY 2010 (2010-2011) a four-year moving average was selected. A comparison of mean and median found no discernable difference; therefore, the mean was used to facilitate comparisons with past reporting. Variability in estimates is in part an artifact of historical data quality as well as the methodology. As data quality improves, more rigorous targets will be set.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, the following process is used by each school to determine the number of dropouts.

- On or before October 1 of each school year, each district conducts a census of all students enrolled at each school to arrive at a school enrollment census total for each grade.
- The number of students transferring into each school after the October 1 census through September 30 of the following school year shall be added to the October 1 census total for each grade.
- The number of students transferring out of each school after the October 1 census through September 30 of the following school year is subtracted from the October 1 census total for each grade.
- The number of students incarcerated, deceased, or graduating early is subtracted from the October 1 census total for each grade.
- Each district maintains separate records regarding students who leave the public school system to be home schooled under Arkansas Code Annotated §6-15-503.
- Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, the calculated school enrollment census total is used to determine the dropout rate for each school.

- For grades two through twelve (2-12), the school enrollment census total for each grade of the current school year is compared to the school enrollment census total for each of the previous grades of the previous school year.
- For grade one (1), the current school year school enrollment census total for grade one is compared to the school enrollment census total for the Kindergarten class of the previous year.

Examples of the calculation used to determine the dropout rate for grades 9 through 12 are as follows:

(a) If the number of dropouts for grade nine was 1 and the October 1 enrollment was 56, the 9th grade dropout rate is $1/56 = .0179$ or 1.79%.

(b) If the number of dropouts for grade 10 was 2 and the October 1 enrollment was 60, the 10th grade dropout rate is $2/60 = .0333$ or 3.33%.

(c) If the number of dropouts for grade 11 was 4 and the October 1 enrollment was 54, the 11th grade dropout rate is $4/54 = .0741$ or 7.41%.

(d) If the number of dropouts for grade 12 was 3 and the October 1 enrollment was 57, the 12th grade dropout rate is $3/57 = .0526$ or 5.26%.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews district dropout data via the Monitoring Profiles to ascertain a district's status with regard to dropout. Each district that triggers on the Monitoring Profiles is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about dropout, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)
In 2005, an average of 3.32% of students with IEPs age 14-21 dropped out of high school as compared to 4.59% of all students grade 9-12 resulting in a mean difference of –1.27 percentage points (3.32% - 4.59%). The analysis further revealed that the special education dropout rate is 27.67% lower than the dropout rate for all students. Additionally, 9 districts (3.5%) triggered on the dropout monitoring priority indicator; thus, identifying them for possible monitoring during the 2005-06 school year.

Discussion of Baseline Data

FFY 2004	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2004-2005)	In 2004, the Arkansas General Assembly passed a new dropout formula to insure that students moving from one district to another would not be inadvertently counted as a dropout. This change in tracking and reporting procedures continues to show the historical lower special education dropout rate when compared to all students in grades 9-12.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Using a moving average based on the past four years (2002 - 2005) of data, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to decline from 3.32 to 2.70%.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	In 2007, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to slightly increase from 2.70 to 2.83%.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	In 2008, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to slightly increase from 2.83 to 2.87%.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	In 2009, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to will peak at 3.01%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	In 2010, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to decline to 2.86%.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	In 2011, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of school to slightly increase from 2.86% to 2.89%. This would represent a 12.95% decrease in the drop out rate for students receiving special education services over the six year SPP.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The State is mindful of the close interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. This interrelationship has been documented in prior State Annual Performance Reports (APRs) highlighting the ongoing emphasis on the general supervision continuous improvement monitoring system which focuses on specific school districts showing poor performance on graduation and dropout rate indicators and secondary grade benchmark assessment results. Prior APRs have also documented the ongoing development of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve post-school outcomes for youth with IEPs.

These activities are considered critical in meeting the improvement targets set in the SPP. These and other critical elements were identified in 2005-06 through the use of the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition (NASET) Self-Assessment Tool. State partners in secondary and postsecondary education established the Arkansas planning priorities prior to the National Center for Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) National Leadership Summit using this tool.

Of the five NASET quality indicators, three (schooling, career preparation, and connecting activities) were chosen by the Arkansas team as priorities for comprehensive planning. Within each of these three priorities, goals and action steps were developed to guide strategies during 2005-06. The three priorities identified are:

SCHOOLING: In order to perform at optimal levels in all educational settings, all youth need to participate in educational programs grounded in standards, clear performance expectations, and graduation exit options based upon meaningful, accurate, and relevant indicators of student learning and skills. Often this occurs without the input from agencies outside of education. Arkansas needs to include other agencies in its school planning to ensure the educational process provides: career and technical programs that are based on professional and industry standards; common performance measures; and individualized transition plans that lead to positive post-school outcomes.

CAREER PREPARATORY EXPERIENCES: Arkansas needs to bring together multi-agency programs to better serve youth with disabilities in the following areas: finding, formally requesting and securing appropriate supports and reasonable accommodations in education, training and employment settings; career assessments to help identify students' school and post-school preferences and interests; structured exposure to post-secondary educational and other life-long learning opportunities; exposure to career opportunity requirements including information about entry requirements, educational requirements, income and benefits potential and asset accumulation; and, improved job-seeking skills and basic work-place skills.

CONNECTING ACTIVITIES: Improve interagency collaboration through: exploration of additional ways to collaborate (e.g., joint training, data sharing, interagency transition conferences, and funding coordination); development of a comprehensive plan for communication and the dissemination of transition information for youth with disabilities; expansion of training and technical assistance.

The State is using staff and resources of the National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth for additional technical assistance related to identifying needed planning partners centering on

transportation, housing, and technology. The State is also using staff funded through Title VI-B set-aside dollars to offer student-specific interventions. These staff members are accessed through the Special Education website request for services process known as "CIRCUIT", (http://arksped.k12.ar.us/sections/circuit.html).

As explained on the CIRCUIT web page, the IDEA authorizes State activities to Local Education Agencies (LEA), including direct and supportive service activities, to improve results for students with disabilities, ages 3 to 21, by ensuring a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. For this purpose, a regional cadre of special education consultants is available who can assist in interventions for students with sensory disabilities, multiple physical disabilities, behavior, and autism spectrum disorders. Services can be requested by parents, guardians, caregivers, school personnel, or any other concerned party. It is anticipated that CIRCUIT will provide school personnel and parents with an easy access process to obtain support for youth with IEPs at risk of dropping out.

The State is using technology, as well, to offer technical assistance resources to students, school personnel, and parents through the new website HighSchoolMatters.com (http://www.highschoolmatters.com). This web resource offers Arkansas-specific information on college, employment, community resources, and self-determination. HighSchoolMatters.com will become a rich resource for offering practical guidance on strategies for staying in school and making the most of the secondary educational experience.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   In addition to developing school-centered strategies begun in 2005-06, the State intends to apply through the National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices for the Academy on Improving Outcomes for Young Adults with Disabilities. Through the Academy, substantial gaps and overlaps in agency programs, particularly in relation to service needs, services provided, and cross-agency performance standards will be addressed.

It is clear that youth with IEPs are underutilizing core services available in the state and that graduation and dropout indicators will improve if this can be effectively addressed. At the State level, Arkansas needs to identify and braid individual funding streams targeted to serving these youth. There is no blueprint to guide local areas that are ready, willing and able to begin co-locating and integrating services.

One of the products of this activity will be the development of a State Resource Map for identified agencies serving Arkansas youth between the ages of 14 and 30. For a student to graduate and to have a good experience in the world of work, the amount and type of preparation that leads to employment can make the difference between success and failure. The changing nature of the job market makes employment more difficult to obtain without specific skills. There are many resources available to students, teachers, counselors and transition coordinators to aid in the postsecondary and career planning process. The problem is that the resources lack integration and are often not user-friendly. Through the Academy, Arkansas hopes to create a comprehensive, integrated and self-directed tool for the student that interfaces aptitudes as determined from test scores and grades, interests, and skills with current Labor Market Information and Occupational Trends. By matching individual skills and aptitudes with career educational and skill requirements, youth with disabilities will identify realistic career goals, including entry into postsecondary educational settings.

The CIRCUIT service request process will be expanded to offer earlier interventions for students at risk of dropping out. HighSchoolMatters.com will expand to offer greater interactivity between state-level and local education and employment personnel.

Today all students are expected to graduate from high school. Yet, hundreds of thousands in the United States leave school early each year without a diploma (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002).

Researchers have identified ninth grade as the most critical point to intervene and prevent students from losing motivation, failing and dropping out of school. According, to the 2005-06 dropout data from the State's Student Information System (SIS) 1,018 ninth graders did not re-enroll for the 2006-07 school year.

Based on the present data, a longitudinal cohort of ninth graders will be established beginning with the 2007-08 school year and will be known as the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. C.O.R.E will include all public school districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and state-operated educational programs. Student performance data will be collected through the SIS in November 2007 for the identification of students failing one or more classes during the initial grading period. Districts, working with the P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams, will administer universal interventions (Response to Intervention) for a period of time not to exceed 10 weeks. A second student performance data collection will be conducted through the SIS on February 15, 2008 to identify students having failed the semester. Once students have been identified as failing the semester, districts will administer targeted interventions (Intervention Prevention) with additional individualized student-centered supports not to exceed 20 weeks. All interventions will be tracked to determine effectiveness to student performance. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will coordinate interventions based upon disaggregated data.

The Secondary Transition Team will provide training on effective transition planning, person centered planning, how to write meaningful transition plans, assistive technology, and technical assistance opportunities; continue the Self-Determination in Arkansas project (SDAR); host the Transition Summit, local transition team meetings, and the Transition Institute; and participate in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum and College Bound Arkansas.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities strategies developed in 2005-06 and refined in 2006-07. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide. CIRCUIT and HighSchoolMatters.com will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving dropout indicators. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project.

Activities planned by the P.O.I.S.E Team for 2007/08 school year include:
- Continuing student-centered problem solving conferences for each referral received through CIRCUIT. District level **P.O.I.S.E. Teams** will be formalized in districts to assist with additional youth that require intense team support to remain in school.
- Completing its website redesign and partnership with agency linkages to participate as a source for a state-wide "Solutions Desk" for youth (Youth of Promise). Technical assistance for agency, school, family and service providers will address gaps in service delivery.
- Assisting districts that triggered for drop-out to establish data sets from retention data. Data-driven information will assist in identification of students to refer for interventions through CIRCUIT. Districts will be provided key points of translating national data into state and local practice as a framework to review their local data to identify academic gaps.
- Hosting the P.O.I.S.E. Youth Development Summit 2008 in partnership with Arkansas Youth Development Collaborative "Youth of Promise" will provide an opportunity for youth referred through CIRCUIT, and other youth serving entities, to develop cross agency supports for innovative education, employment, and independent living options.
- Providing cross agency training and resource sharing for professional staff development for member groups of the Arkansas Youth Development Collaborative. Districts that refer students through CIRCUIT around interventions and evidence-based transition practices will receive assistance with programming based upon the unique needs of the students referred for services, and additional parent information sessions to facilitate interventions.

- Convening a forum of stakeholders of youth involved in Alternative Education, Juvenile Justice, and Foster Care to provide the benefits of the effective systematic technical assistance direct service model. Youth development during the transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of academic development and functional needs of the child are critical for successful outcomes.
- Identifying LEAs for C.O.R.E. to formulate the Cohort in partnership with IDEA Data & Research to design the research bases for data collection.
- Providing professional development for pilot districts for C.O.R.E. for Check and Connect, KUDER and student-centered problem solving.
- P.O.I.S.E. will provide professional development through AR-LEARN for behavioral interventions for Secondary students.

Additional activities aimed at improving drop out rates will be conducted throughout the year by the secondary transition consultants, with an emphasis on local transition planning for low incidence populations and college bound students.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)
State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities strategies developed in 2005-06 and refined in the subsequent years. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide.

- Arkansas Transition Services will host and/or participate in various workshops including:
  - National DCDT Conference, "Brewing Best Practices in Transition," in Milwaukee, WI, October 16-17, 2008
  - 2008 DD Conference Presented by the DD Network, "Community - Together It's Better: Together Everyone Achieves More," Arlington Hotel, Hot Springs, AR., October 16-17, 2008
  - Tenth Annual Arkansas Conference for Parent Education and Parental Involvement, Hot Springs Convention Center, Hot Springs, AR., October 20-22, 2008
  - AR-DCDT Pre-Conference at AR-CEC in Hot Springs, AR; The KUDER Assessment, November 12, 2008
  - AR-CEC Conference, "Weaving Changes for the Future," Hot Springs Convention Center, November 13-14, 2008
- Arkansas Transition Services is collaborating with the Division on Career Development and Transition and KUDER to provide a pre-conference workshop on the KUDER Career Planning System at the Arkansas Council for Exceptional Children conference in November 2008. Approximately forty teachers will attend to learn about the assessment tool. Arkansas Transition

Services will provide additional training on how to use the KUDER in the implementation of an effective transition plan.

- Transition Retreat. On December 10–11, 2008, teachers and Special Education Supervisors from three school districts will attend the first Transition Retreat at the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute. This retreat affords the schools the opportunity to learn about and get hands-on exposure to age appropriate Transition assessments, what they measure, the population they are appropriate for, guidelines for administration, etc. The teachers will be shown how the results of the reviewed assessments could be utilized in the development of a more productive and beneficial transition plan.

- Cadre meetings will be held at least quarterly to present team leaders with the latest information and professional development. A cadre meeting for leaders and co-leaders of local teams around the state will be held February 10-11, 2009 in Little Rock. This meeting will provide teams with professional development on self-determination from Tom Holub, who will present information to teachers on how to begin or continue implementation of self-determination in their classrooms. Information on indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 will be presented by NSTTAC consultants and teams will give input on planning for the October Summit. A second Cadre meeting is also being planned for June 2009. Professional development will again be provided to teams as well as an opportunity to update team plan progress and prepare for the October Summit.

- Transition Planning and Preparation for Students with Asperger's and High Functioning Autism Workshop. This workshop addressing Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) is scheduled for February 12, 2009. Special education teachers, supervisors and vocational rehabilitation counselors are invited to attend this all day training. This presentation will guide participants to a better understanding of the issues related to transition to college for students on the Spectrum and introduce strategies to prepare, assess and work with this population. It will also provide strategies for students with Autism and Asperger's who are not planning to attend college. Participants will:
    o Understand the skills and preparation needed for students with ASD to transition to higher education settings
    o Learn how and when to begin preparing students on the Spectrum for the college option
    o Understand documentation requirements needed for ADA and Section 504 considerations at the post-secondary level
    o Learn how to help individuals with ASD gain insight into their disability and the ways in which it affects different areas of functioning in higher education settings
    o Become aware of alternative options for students with ASD for transition to college
    o Learn strategies to work with parents of ASD students and establish appropriate personal boundaries
    o Regional Transitions Class Trainings will be offered April 8, 2009

The P.O.I.S.E. staff and constituent teams will engage in a variety of activities to enhance graduation.
- Professional Development on Making Connection Among Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 and utilization of this process in local school districts for requesting assistance through CIRCUIT.
- Technical Assistance (regional) for a network of local school districts that triggered in both indicator 1 and 2 to develop frameworks for school completion with the assistance of the Check and Connect Model
- Partnership with Arkansas Greater Graduation for Drop-out Prevention Summits to be held with local school districts statewide
- Partnership with High Schools that Work to implement 9th grade redesign statewide
- Parental Involvement: Pre-Transition age students will be provided unlimited access through radio broadcasts to receive information related to transition topics to increase their participation in schooling, career preparation, and workforce readiness

- Resource Partnership with Afterschool Network for youth at risk of dropping out of school prior to graduation
- Up-grade P.O.I.S.E. website to include drop-out prevention focus and parental involvement priorities
- Professional Development Presentation, "Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.)," by the P.O.I.S.E Coordinator at Special Show 2008

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be implemented statewide. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is scheduled for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.

Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be operational statewide. CIRCUIT and HighSchoolMatters.com will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving dropout indicators. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will expand and continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 03: Assessment

Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

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 the disability subgroup

B) Participation rate for children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards

C) Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

A) AYP

Percent = Number of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total number of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State times 100.

B) Participation

a. Number of children with IEPs in assessed grades

b. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100)

c. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100)

d. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = d divided by a times 100)

e. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment by alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100)

Number of students not tested and the reasons why

Account for any children included in a but not in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Participation Percent = $(b + c + d + e)$ divided by a

C) Proficiency Rate

a. Number of children with IEPs in assessed grades

b. Number of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100)

c. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100)

d. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100)

e. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100)

Account for any children included in a but not in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Proficiency Percent = $(b + c + d + e)$ divided by a

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

All children with IEPs participate annually in statewide criterion referenced assessments in mathematics and literacy, in the assessed grades of 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Students in grade 11 are assessed in literacy only. These are the same assessments used for reporting Adequate Yearly Progress for accountability in the No Child Left Behind Act. These assessments are based on the State curriculum frameworks for children with and without IEPs. Children with IEPs may take the exams with or without the allowed accommodations.

End of Course exams are given in algebra (grade 9) and geometry (grade10). In addition to these assessments, science assessments are given in grades 5 and 7 and a biology assessment is given in grade 10. The scores from these exams are not included presently in the districts' calculation for AYP.

Annual assessments in mathematics and literacy using an alternate portfolio will be administered to children with a significant cognitive disability in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and the literacy exam in grade 11. An alternate assessment with a portfolio is also available for science in grades 5 and 7. Each student must meet the eligibility for the alternate portfolio as determined through evaluations, observations, and the student IEP conference. This eligibility must be reflected in the student's current IEP including a signed notification by the child's parents that they understand their child is being assessed with an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

Additional alternate portfolio assessments are given for students enrolled in 9th grade math, who are not expected to enroll in algebra or geometry courses and to take the End of Course assessment in those subjects. A similar portfolio assessment is available for students with IEPs enrolled in resource biology. These assessments are aligned to the grade level content standards for the subjects; however, the eligibility for these assessments is not based on the criteria for students having a significant cognitive disability.

Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, the criterion referenced statewide benchmark exam will be replaced with a new augmented assessment; combining criterion referenced-standards based items with norm-referenced items. A composite score as well as separate scores will be made available for students taking this exam.

Determining the Minimum n

The minimum n, established for NCLB reporting, is 40 or 5% of total school enrollment. Because the cut-points are calculated by AYP group (K-5, 6-8, 9-12) these minimum n's were calculated by summing the enrollment of all the schools within each AYP group for each district.

For example, District A had 5 schools,
  1) a K-4 with 200 students enrolled
  2) a 3-5 with 100 students enrolled
  3) a 5-8 with 400 students enrolled
  4) a 4-8 with 500 students enrolled
  5) a 9-12 with 1000 students enrolled

Schools 1 and 2 are both within the K-5 grouping for AYP, and therefore the district-level K-5 enrollment would be 200+100=300. For the K-5 AYP group, the minimum n would remain 40. Schools 3 and 4 are both within the 6-8 grouping for AYP, and therefore the district-level 6-8 enrollment would be 400+500=900. For the 6-8 AYP group, the minimum n would be 5% of 900 or 45 students. School 5 would be in the 9-12 AYP grouping, and therefore the district-level 9-12 enrollment would be 1000, and hence a minimum n of 50.

Additionally, when determining how many districts met the minimum n for children with IEPs it is important to examine each subject separately, because different numbers of students will take a literacy and a mathematics assessment within each district as a result of the End of Course exams.

Determining AYP Progress for the Disability Subgroup (children with IEPs)

The Percent Proficient in literacy and mathematics was then calculated for each AYP group within the district (n=40). For example, the number of non-mobile students with disability codes who attempted the literacy assessment at schools 1 and 2 divides the number of non-mobile students with disability codes who were proficient in literacy at schools 1 and 2. If this number was greater than the percent required to meet standards for K-5 literacy, then the district was identified as meeting standards for K-5 literacy for children with IEPS. It is important to note that Safe Harbor Eligibility was not considered.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)
A) AYP

Percent = Number of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total number of districts in the State times 100.

Literacy

Grade Level	# of districts with AYP subgroups	# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives	Percent of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives
K-5	5	0	0.00%
6-8	32	1	3.13%
9-12	7	0	0.00%
All Grades	**44**	**1**	**2.27%**

Mathematics

Grade Level	# of districts with AYP sub groups	# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives	Percent of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives
K-5	5	0	0.00%
6-8	42	8	19.05%
9-12	27	16	59.26%
All Grades	**74**	**24**	**32.43%**

B) Participation
   a. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed: 31,622
   b. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100): 9,490
   c. Number of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100): 18,069
   d. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100): Not applicable
   e. Number of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100): 2,628

Number of students not tested and the reasons why: 1,435

Students not tested were located in residential treatment facilities, juvenile detention centers, were hospital/homebound, served in private schools, absent during testing and the make-up period, or determined to be too medically fragile to be assessed.

Overall Participation Percent = (9,490 + 18,069 + 0 + 2,628) divided by a: 95.46%

C) Performance Proficiency
Proficiency Rate: Literacy
a. Number of children with IEPs assessed in grades assessed: 30,184
b. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by times 100): 1,415 or 4.69%
c. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by times 100): 611 or 2.02%
d. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by times 100): Not applicable
e. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by times 100): 802 or 2.66%

Overall Proficiency Percent = (b + c + d + e) divided by a = 9.37%

Proficiency Rate: Mathematics
a. Number of children with IEPs assessed in grades assessed: 27,053
b. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by times 100): 1,488 or 5.50%
c. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by times 100): 1,233 or 4.56%
d. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100): Not applicable
e. Number of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100): 624 or 2.31%

Overall Proficiency Percent = (b + c + d + e) divided by a = 12.36%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	**AYP** **Literacy** In the grade level group of K-5 zero of five districts met AYP objectives (0%). Similarly, the grade level group of 9-12 yielded zero of 7 districts meeting AYP objectives (0%). While the grade level group of 6-8 had one of 32 districts reach AYP objectives (3.13%). For literacy in 2004-05, there were 44 districts with a reportable disability subgroup. One district met the State AYP objectives resulting in 2.27% of districts meeting AYP objectives. **Mathematics** In the grade level group of K-5 zero of five districts met AYP objectives (0%). While the grade level group of 6-8 had eight of 42 districts reach AYP objectives (19.05%). Furthermore, the grade level group of 9-12 yielded 16 of 27 districts meeting AYP objectives (59.26%). For mathematics in 2004-05, there were 74 districts with a reportable disability subgroup. Of which 24 districts met the State AYP objectives resulting in 32.43 %.

Assessment Participation
Regular Assessment Participation
The benchmark for measuring this performance target is that by the year 2005, 95 % of all students with disabilities will participate in the State assessment program, with or without accommodations. The average participation rate for students with disabilities in Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 is 95.46%.

After 5 years of testing students in grades 4, 6, 8, and 11 on the statewide benchmark exams, the State added the grades of 3, 5, and 7 for the 2004-2005 school year. Previous standards and cut scores were set and calculated using only the scores from students in grades of 4, 6, 8, and 11. New cut scores were established in the 2004-2005 school year to encompass the new grades of 3, 5, and 7.

This psychometric re-setting of the scores created a major difference in the resulting rankings of the 2004-2005 test scores. Scores prior to 2004-2005 were considerably higher; therefore, the drop produced by the new scoring levels was pronounced. With the increased number of grades tested and the increased numbers of students participating in the assessments, the scores for 2004-2005 became the new baseline for performance and participation. It is not possible now to make any comparison of the scores prior to 2004-2005 with the new scale score for a variety of psychometric reasons.

Alternate Assessment Participation
For each grade level assessment offered through the benchmark in literacy and mathematics, an alternate assessment in the form of a portfolio assessment is offered for those students who have a significant cognitive disability (SCD). Eligibility criteria have been established for determining those students with a SCD. Only those students identified through their IEPs as eligible for an alternate assessment are permitted to be assessed with the alternate portfolio. All scores in the alternate portfolio are calculated against alternate achievement standards. The alternate achievement standards produce 5 performance levels against a predetermined rubric. These performance levels are Independent, Supportive Independence, Functional Independence, Emerging and Not Evident. Scores in the Independent level and Functional Independent level are equated to proficiency on the regular benchmark exams. All other performance levels are considered less than proficient for AYP purposes.

Performance Proficiency
The percentage of children with IEPs that reach performance proficiency is 20 to 30 percentage points lower than all students in the State. However, the percentage of children with IEPS who reach performance proficiency should increase at the same rate as for all students under AYP progress. It will be a challenge for the state to meet this target due to the rate of increase required.

Regular Assessment With and Without Accommodations Performance Results
Performance results for the 2004-05 school year become baseline for accountability purposes since they were calculated on the new populations of grades and students tested. Prior scores were for students in grades 4, 6, 8, and 11. The new 2004-05 standards were set and the cut scores based on students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11. There is no data for comparison so the scores presented here will be used for future comparisons.

Students were assessed on the benchmark exam in the areas of literacy and math in grades 3-8 and literacy only in grade 11. Based on a total of 27,556 students taking the benchmark

	exam, there was a 6.76% proficiency rate statewide for students with disabilities in literacy for the year 2004-2005. The rate for proficiency ranged from 14.40% to 4.30% for grades 3-8 with stronger rates being in the earlier grade levels. There were 24,425 students taking the mathematics portion of the exam. The statewide average for students proficient in mathematics for grades 3-8 was an average of 12.02%. These scores ranged from 29.47% to 3.49%. The stronger scores were seen in the early grades, due primarily to the extreme emphasis which has been given in the early grades to intervention and supplemental programming in mathematics. **Alternate Assessment Results** The addition of grades 3, 5, and 7 to the alternate assessments again required a rescaling of the cut scores for the 2004-2005 school year. Scores for the previous 5 years had showed rapid gains toward proficiency; however, the new scores cannot be compared to the old ones, creating a new baseline for the 2004-05 school year. There were 2628 students assessed with an alternate portfolio in grades 3-8 and 11 for the 2004-05 school year. These portfolios were scored against alternate achievement standards by an outside vendor. The areas of literacy and mathematics were assessed in the portfolio the same as for the benchmarks. The average score of Independence or proficient on the portfolio was 26.8% for all grades in mathematics and 29.16 in literacy. These scores ranged from 26% to 28% in mathematics and from 15% to 33% in literacy. Scores for literacy improved each year from the earliest grades to grade 8. There was no pattern in mathematics with all of the scores fairly equal across all the grades.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 9.0%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 36.48%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB. **Performance Proficiency** The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2005-06 is 13.17%. The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2005-06 is 18.54%.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 15.91%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 40.54%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB. **Performance Proficiency** The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2006-07 is 19.58%.

	The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2006-07 is 25.06%.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 22.73%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 44.59%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB. **Performance Proficiency** The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2007-08 is 25.99%. The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2007-08 is 31.58%.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 29.55%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 48.65%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB. **Performance Proficiency** The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2008-09 is 32.40%. The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2008-09 is 38.10%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 38.64%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 52.70%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB. **Performance Proficiency** The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2009-10 is 38.81%. The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2009-10 is 44.62%.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	**AYP** **Literacy:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 45.45%. **Mathematics:** The percent of districts meeting AYP objectives will be 56.76%. **Participation** The participation target is 95% as in accordance with NCLB.

	Performance Proficiency The anticipated State average percentage point gain for literacy is 6.41; therefore, the target for 2010-11 is 45.22%. The anticipated State average percentage point gain for mathematics is 6.52; therefore, the target for 2010-11 is 51.14%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit in the Department of Education will combine efforts to explain the rationale and consequences of the new rating scale. While it appears that the students made little to no progress toward proficiency, this is not truly the case. The use of the new scoring standard caused all scores to be dramatically lower, thus creating a new baseline for future comparisons.

The participation rate has shown an improvement and the expected 95% has been attained. District personnel will be trained by staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit in the proper accounting and coding procedures to assure that this level of participation does not decrease.

Regional training by staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit for test coordinators, special education supervisors and other staff persons will be held in both the fall and spring. During these sessions, explicit directions will be given on proper test administration and portfolio preparation. A CD/DVD will be given to each of the participants in the training to serve as a refresher when they return to their classrooms and prepare for the assessments.

Training by staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit on the proper use of accommodations on the benchmark will be given to all persons involved in the administration of the exams. The publication, "Guidebook for Assessment Accommodations for Students with Disabilities" will be utilized for this training.

Since the benchmark exams are based on the State's curriculum frameworks and content standards, additional training sessions will be given with an emphasis on curriculum based instruction and standards performance.

Test taking skills will be emphasized in the classroom and practice exams will be utilized in all grades.

With the new baseline data for all students involved in the assessment program, it will be easier to track actual individual students and their progress from grade to grade. By utilizing the E Guide, individual test item analysis is available. Teachers and administrators will be encouraged by staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit to use this data in an effort to determine how scores are reported, which items and which standards are being missed and by which students.

Summer camps conducted by staff of the Special Education Unit and the ADE Accountability Unit will be held to assist general and special educators in implementing research based literacy interventions more effectively.

Staff funded by the State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue to provide on-site consultation in Arkansas elementary schools, their feeder middle schools and high schools to ensure special educators have the training and expertise to provide consultation to general education teachers in implementing scientifically based literacy interventions to students with disabilities.

SIG activities will continue to focus on improving student achievement including parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral supports.

Staff of the State Improvement Grant will develop web-based Literacy Intervention Modules to address the five essential elements of literacy developed for special education teachers statewide.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   Training of district personnel in test administration and portfolio preparation will be conducted by staff of the Special Education Unit in the fall of 2006 and in the spring of 2007. Training in standards-based curriculum and assessment will be given in the fall of 2006 to all special education teachers.

Staff funded by the State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue to provide on-site consultation in Arkansas elementary schools, their feeder middle schools and high schools to ensure special educators have the training and expertise to provide consultation to general education teachers in implementing scientifically based literacy interventions to students with disabilities.

Training modules will be developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs. These modules are designed to train a network of parents with children with disabilities to mentor other parents on working with their children at home in the areas of literacy and positive behavioral practices.

Through the SEU partnership with the ADE K-12 Literacy Unit, SIG activities will incorporate a more targeted focus on adolescent literacy by providing professional development and follow-up to secondary educators (general and special education) in the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), with an ultimate goal of all students reaching proficiency.

The SEU will participate in the ADE's Closing the Achievement Gap (CTAG) initiative which is broadly formulated on an infrastructure aligned with a problem solving decision-making model and response to intervention design.

Training will be provided by the staff of the ADE Special Education Unit and nationally recognized experts on the selection, use, and evaluation of accommodations for students with disabilities on statewide assessments.

Staff of the State Improvement Grant will finalize the development of web-based Literacy Intervention Modules to address the five essential elements of literacy developed for use by special education teachers statewide.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   Training of district personnel in test administration and portfolio preparation will be conducted in the fall of 2007 and in the spring of 2008 by staff of the Special Education Unit. Training in standards-based curriculum and assessment will be provided in the fall of 2007 to all special education teachers.

State Improvement Grant Staff will provide statewide professional development to Arkansas general and special education teachers in the use of two web-based Literacy Intervention tools (developed through the State Improvement Grant) addressing the five essential areas of literacy.

Through the ADE-SEU partnership with the ADE K-12 Literacy Unit, the SIG will continue to expand its focus on adolescent literacy in 2007-2008 by providing high quality professional development, including coaching and technical assistance, to secondary educators (general and special education) in the research

based strategies of the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) with the ultimate goal of all students reaching proficiency.

Staff funded by the State Improvement Grant will continue to provide on-site consultation in Arkansas elementary schools, their feeder middle schools and high schools to ensure special educators have the training and expertise to provide consultation to general education teachers in implementing scientifically based literacy interventions to students with disabilities.

SIG activities will continue to focus on improving student achievement, building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral support. Training modules developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs will be implemented by SIG parent mentors during the 2007-08 school year.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

Training will be provided by the staff of the ADE Special Education Unit to selected Educational Cooperatives and local school districts in the interpretation of assessment results and the application of these results toward improving scores for AYP accountability.

The Special Education Unit will develop a checklist for use in monitoring on-site testing for the benchmark exams on test day. This checklist will include examination of the students IEP in relation to the form of test the student is given, the accommodations recommended in the IEP, the actual use of the accommodations, and the requisite training provided for those persons responsible for the administration of the tests and the provision of accommodations.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students reach proficiency.

At the invitation of the Arkansas Association of Special Education Administrators, staff of the ADE-SEU will present an intensive two day seminar in June 2008 in Eureka Springs, AR for more than 200 LEAs and other related professionals on the new state regulations for special education programs. While the emphasis of the meeting will be on the new State regulations, considerable time will be devoted to the issues of assessment including specific related topics of IEP Team responsibilities, data reporting, accommodation use and evaluation.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   Training of district personnel in test administration and portfolio preparation will be conducted in the fall of 2008 and in the spring of 2009 by staff of the Special Education Unit. Training in standards-based curriculum and assessment will be provided in the fall of 2008 to all special education teachers.

SIG activities will continue to focus on improving student achievement.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students reach proficiency.

The 2008 Special Show will be held in Hot Springs in July of 2008 with a theme of planning for the future. Several sessions will be devoted to assessment, portfolio preparations, alignment of standards to assessment, and other aspects of the assessment system in the state. More than 2000 participants will attend this conference.

A special presentation will be made to the Arkansas Association of Special Education Administrators (AASEA) at their meeting in Hot Springs in November 2008. Detailed information will be given to them on assessment and aligning instruction to standards that align to the benchmark exams.

A regional pre-school workshop presentation will be given to the administrators in the OUR Service Cooperative in Harrison in August of 2008 on the topic of assessment, achieving AYP, and improving proficiency scores of students with disabilities.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010) Training of district personnel in test administration and portfolio preparation will be conducted in the fall of 2009 and in the spring of 2010 by staff of the Special Education Unit. Training in standards-based curriculum and assessment will be given in the fall of 2009 to all special education teachers.

ADE will continue to focus on improving student achievement building upon efforts originally associated with SIG activities, contingent upon availability of funds.

Smart Accountability is Arkansas' new system of differentiated accountability for schools. Approved by the U.S. Department of Education in January, 2009, Smart Accountability allows for varying labels and interventions for schools placed in "school improvement" status under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. This new approach will allow the department to support school administrators in most effectively choosing and applying interventions to address student achievement needs in their schools.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011) Training of district personnel in test administration and portfolio preparation will be conducted in the fall of 2010 and in the spring of 2011 by staff of the Special Education Unit. Training in standards-based curriculum and assessment will be provided for all special education teachers in the fall of 2010.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 04: Suspension/Expulsion

A) Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year

B) Percent of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement

> **A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.
>
> **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.
>
> Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Arkansas collects discipline data for all students through the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) at the building level. Discipline data are submitted to APSCN during Cycle 7 (June) each year. Upon closing the cycle, the ADE Special Education Unit receives two data pulls, one for children with disabilities by race and one for all students by race meeting the greater than 10 days out-of school suspensions or expulsions reporting requirement; thus, allowing for comparative analysis.

Formula: Suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities – Suspension/expulsion rate for all students = Difference between Special Education & District.

In addition, weighted risk ratios are calculated to identify if any district is suspending or expelling students of a racial/ethnic group at a greater rate than other racial/ethnic groups.

A four-year moving average was used to project suspension/expulsion rates through 2011. A comparison between mean and median found no discernable difference; therefore, the mean was used to facilitate comparisons with past reporting. Variability in estimates is in part an artifact of historical data quality as well as the methodology. As data quality improves, more rigorous targets will be set.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

While districts across the State should be suspending or expelling small numbers of children each school year regardless of their status, the percentage of children with disabilities being suspended or expelled annually in a district should not significantly differ from those general education students in the district who are suspended or expelled. Thus, it is important to ensure that similar percentages of special education and general education students in a district are receiving school suspensions or expulsions each year.

Arkansas collects discipline data for all students through the APSCN at the building level. Discipline data are submitted to APSCN during Cycle 7 (June) each year. Upon closing the cycle, the special education Grants and Data Management (G/DM) section receives a data pull for all students meeting the greater than 10 days out-of school suspensions or expulsions reporting requirement; thus, allowing for comparative analysis.

The special education benchmark for suspension/expulsion (s/e) rate is the three-year difference between the district rate for all students as compared to children with Disabilities greater than 10 days out-of-school suspension/expulsion. The statewide three-year average s/e rate for children with Disabilities is 1.13%. The statewide three-year district average s/e rate for all students is 1.04%. Comparing the average for total district and special education shows a 0.09% difference, with a standard deviation of 1.15%. The trigger for this indicator is one standard deviation beyond the average difference for the State, or the mean difference (0.09%) plus one standard deviation (1.15%) or 1.24%. Thus, any district that suspends or expels 1.24% more of its children with Disabilities as compared to all students will be identified for possible focused monitoring on this indicator.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews district suspension/expulsion data via the Focused Monitoring Profiles to ascertain a district's status with regard to discipline. Each district that triggers on the Focused Monitoring Profiles is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about suspension/expulsion, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans.

While each local education agency sets its own discipline policy, districts are also required to follow the special education rules and regulations. In addition, student level uniform reporting is required through the APSCN which includes:

Date of Discipline - The date upon which the disciplinary action for an offense begins

Duration of Disciplinary Action - The number of days of the disciplinary action

Infraction – The code that best describes the violation or infraction:

01 = Drugs	06 = Staff Assault	11 = Club	16 = Explosives
02 = Alcohol	07 = Knife	12 = Gangs	17 = Other
03 = Tobacco	08 = Handgun	13 = Vandalism	18 = Bullying
04 = Truancy	09 = Rifle	14 = Insubordination	
05 = Student Assault	10 = Shotgun	15 = Disorderly Conduct	

General Action Taken – The punitive action taken by the school authority or court authority to reprimand the student after an offense is committed as:

01 = In-School Suspension	07 = No Action
02 = Out-of-School Suspension (Not to exceed 10 days)	08 = Alternative Learning Environment
03 = Expelled (Does not include weapons or drugs)	09 = Expelled for Drugs
04 = Expelled for Weapons	10 = Expelled for Dangerousness with
05 = Corporal Punishment	substantial likelihood of causing bodily
06 = Other	harm

Shortened Expulsion – Was the expulsion (action-taken =03 or 04) reported for infractions 08, 09, 10 or 16 shortened to a term of less than one year by the chief administering officer under the case-by case modification provisions of Section 14601 (b) of the Gun Free School Act?
Alternative Placement – Was the expulsion (action-taken =03 or 04) reported and referred to an alternative school or program?

Student Status – Enter the appropriate code designating student status at the time of this infraction.
RG = Regular Student
SP = Special Education Student

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

    A) Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 6.15%.

    B) Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.

Discussion of Baseline Data

FFY 2004	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(2004-2005)	The suspension/expulsion rate historically has been higher for children with disabilities than the rate for all students. In 2005 the special education rate is only 0.03 percentage points from equaling the rate for all students. In 2005, the unduplicated count of students suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 438. The focused monitoring suspension/expulsion trigger identified 16 or 6 % of districts for possible monitoring. Each district that triggers is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about suspension/expulsion, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans. In addition, the Special Education Unit has been the leader throughout Arkansas in promoting school-based mental health programs for children with and without disabilities and school-based positive behavioral support programs through the State Improvement Grant (SIG). Furthermore, districts are analyzing their discipline data to assist in the identification of students for school based mental health services.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 7.60%. In 2006, the unduplicated count of students suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days was 661. The focused monitoring suspension/expulsion trigger identified 23 or 9.06% of districts for possible monitoring. Each district that triggers is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about suspension/expulsion, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans. The Arkansas Department of Education collects all data elements at the student level; however, prior to 2005-06 the Special Education Unit received aggregated data from APSCN—LEA student counts greater than 10 days by race. In 2005-06 when the data were forwarded to the SEU at the student level discipline data, as opposed to aggregated counts, the IDEA Data & Research Office identified anomalies in the data set, such as: 1. there were more students than in previous years;

	2. the field for reporting the number of "days" suspended was often blank; 3. APSCN did not have the "days" field as a required field This analysis found that in the past when the SEU was sent aggregated data if the "day" field was blank that incident was wasn't included in the calculation. The IDEA Data & Research Office worked with the APSCN Student Management System staff to implement a Phase I edit to occur when a district attempts to submit their discipline with a blank "day" field when the action taken resulted in an OSS or in school suspension; the district is blocked from submitting until the field is corrected. The change in the data collection and cleansing process identified 53.36% more student in 2005-06 than the aggregated data of 2004-05. **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 5.91%. In 2005-06, 5.91% or 15 districts were identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year using the risk ratio methodology. Eleven of the 15 districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of black students and four districts for white (non-Hispanic students): • American Indian/Alaskan Native 0.00% • Asian/Pacific Islander 0.00% • Black (non-Hispanic) 4.33% • Hispanic or Latino 0.00% • White (non-Hispanic) 1.57%
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 7.59%. **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: N/A.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 7.11%. **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: N/A

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 6.60% **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: N/A.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 6.23%. **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: N/A
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	**A)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: 6.00%. **B)** Percent = the number of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100: N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006) In 2005-06, 15 school districts triggered on the significant discrepancy suspension/expulsion indicator. These districts have been instructed to include suspension/expulsion strategies in their ACSIP process for addressing excessive restrictive placements. In addition, training by the ADE will target these districts. A large part of the training effort with school districts is the focus on an understanding of discipline decisions and other aspects of special education performance.

The ADE will also continue the expansion of the School-Based Mental Health (SBMH) Network beyond the 60 districts currently participating. Data collected from Network school districts indicate a direct correlation between the provision of school-based mental health services and discipline referrals.

The ADE will expand the Focused Monitoring Profiles to include weighted risk ratios for the black, white, and Hispanic racial/ethnic groups.

In addition, data collection procedures will change to student level instead of aggregated.

SIG activities addressing positive behavior supports will continue to work on reducing the number of discipline referrals. Additionally, SIG activities will focus on building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral supports.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue to use discipline indicators as part of the focused monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. The SBMH Network will continue to expand statewide.

The IDEA Data & Research Office in conjunction with M/PE section will expand the Focused Monitoring Profiles to include weighted risk ratios for all racial/ethnic groups.

SIG activities addressing positive behavior supports will continue to work on reducing the number of discipline referrals.

Training modules will be developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs. These modules are designed to train a network of parents with children with disabilities to mentor other parents on working with their children at home in the areas of literacy and positive behavioral practices.

The SEU will participate in the ADE's Closing the Achievement Gap (CTAG) initiative which is broadly formulated on an infrastructure aligned with a problem solving decision-making model and response to intervention design.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue to use discipline indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. The ADE-SEU will continue to work with the SBMH Network.

In an effort to provide a broader array of program options for children with hearing impairment or deafness, the SEU in conjunction with the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) will provide a training/planning workshop for stakeholders on the establishment of regionalized educational services.

SIG activities addressing positive behavior supports will continue to focus on reducing the number of discipline referrals. Additionally, SIG activities will continue the work of building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral support. Training modules developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs will be implemented by SIG parent mentors during the 2007-08 school year.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students access the general education curriculum.

The SEU will continue to use the Centralized Intake and Referral/Consultant Unified Intervention Team (CIRCUIT) to receive request from parents, guardians, caregivers, school personnel, or any other concerned party. CIRCUIT provides school personnel and parents with an easy access process to obtain support for students with disabilities with behavior problems that could lead to disciplinary action.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)
The ADE will continue to use discipline indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight of the correction of noncompliance by districts that trigger. The ADE will continue to work with the School-Based Mental Health (SBMH) Network; however, due to funding constraints, grants have been reduced and no new districts are anticipated to be added to the network.

SIG activities addressing positive behavior supports will continue to focus on reducing the number of discipline referrals.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Some activities being undertaken this year are:
- "Disobedient, Disruptive, Defiant, and Disturbed Students: Behavioral Intervention for Challenging Students" to be offered at five different sites across Arkansas. The dates for each offering are February 13 and 16, 2009; March 9 and 20, 2009; and April 3, 2009.
- "Suspending and Expelling Students with Disabilities: The Do's and Don'ts/ Conducting Solid Manifestation Determinations" will be offered on March 3, 2009.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students access the general education curriculum.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue to use discipline indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. The ADE will continue to work with the School-Based Mental Health (SBMH) Network; however, due to funding constraints, grants have been reduced and no new districts have been added to the network.

ADE will continue to focus on improving student achievement building upon efforts originally associated with SIG activities, contingent upon availability of funds.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to use discipline indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 05: School Age LRE
Percent of Children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

A) Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day
B) Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day
C) Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

> **A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
> **B)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
> **C)** Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.

A four-year moving average of the percent change was used to calculate the 6-21 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) projection rates through 2011. Variability in estimates is in part an artifact of historical data quality as well as the methodology. As data quality improves, more rigorous targets will be set.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Children with IEPs should receive support and services, to the greatest extent possible, in general education classes. Thus, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs is tracking the number of children with IEPs in school districts who receive special education services outside the regular classroom less than 21% of the school day ("regular class" placement).

In 2002-03, the ADE initiated a Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring (CIFM) system designed to identify school districts in significant need of special education improvement. LRE was developed as an area of emphasis, with triggers developed and applied to those districts with significant discrepancies compared to other Arkansas school districts.

The benchmark for LRE is the three-year state average of the proportion of children with IEPs, grades K-12, receiving special education services outside the regular classroom less than 21% of the school day. The statewide average for "regular class" placement was 40.71% in 2001-02, 41.09% in 2002-03, and 43.21% in 2003-04. The three-year state average for LRE is 41.67%, with a standard deviation of 16.54.

The trigger for this indicator is one standard deviation below the State average, or the State average (41.67%) minus one standard deviation (16.54) or 25.13%. Thus, any district that has 25.13% or fewer of its children with IEPs served outside the regular classroom less than 21% of the school day will be identified for focused monitoring on this indicator.

Arkansas does not trigger on "Other" educational placements categories; however, the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section reviews other settings for irregularities via the child count data and while conducting on-site folder reviews.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews district LRE data via the Monitoring Profiles to ascertain a district's status with regard to LRE. Each district that triggers on the

Monitoring Profiles is required to include an action plan in the district's submission of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). To address the localized concerns about LRE, the monitoring staff works with the districts to develop their ACSIP plans.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

A) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100:

(25,055/56,449) x 100 = 44.39%

B) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100:

(7073/56,449) x 100 = 12.53%

C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100:

1,455/56449 = 2.58%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	The percentage of children receiving special education services in the regular class 80% or more of the day is 44.39%; which is consistent with previous years. The number of children spending more than 60% of their day outside the regular class has decreased (7.78%) as more students are being served in the resource room (21% to 60% of time outside the regular class): 38.79%. Further, students in other placements are remaining static at 2.58%. The analysis of 2004-05 baseline data and projections forward to 2011 in general indicate an ever-decreasing percentage of students educated in more restrictive settings. The measurable and rigorous target for each federal fiscal year is shown below.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 46.33%. **B)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.53%. **C)** Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.58%.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 48.91%. **B)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.52%.

	C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.58%.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 51.49%.
	B) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.52%.
	C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.57%.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 54.29%.
	B) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.52%.
	C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.57%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 56.93%.
	B) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.51%.
	C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.56%.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	**A)** Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 59.77%.
	B) Percent = number of children with IEPs removed from the regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 12.51%.
	C) Percent = number of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100: 2.56%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   In 2005-06, 17 school districts have triggered on the LRE indicator. These districts have been instructed to include LRE in their ACSIP process for addressing excessive restrictive placements. In addition, training by the SEA will target these districts. A large part of the training effort with school districts is the focus on an understanding of placement decisions and other aspects of special education performance.

By including LRE indicators as an area of focus during 2005-06, the SEA and local districts will develop local strategies for addressing placement decisions within the context of overall school improvement, provider qualifications, and academic performance. These strategies will include recommendations for:

- Pre-service training for all teachers that emphasizes educating children with IEPs in general education settings
- Ongoing professional development that ensures general classroom teachers have the skills and knowledge to work with students with a range of disabilities
- Focus on high quality curriculum instruction for all students
- Policies and procedures emphasizing collaboration between general and special education teachers
- Use of up to 15 percent of Title VI-B funds for Early Intervening Services tied to addressing school district excessive use of restrictive placements

The Arkansas State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue tracking the LRE of students participating in Goal 1 Literacy. (A target of the SIG is to analyze if students in schools participating in Goal 1: Literacy, are moving from a more restrictive environment to a lesser restrictive environment.)

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue to use LRE indicators as part of the focused monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. Districts that trigger are required to include an action plan in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). In addition, the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section will review each ACSIP and work with districts to ensure they are calculating the percentage of time accurately.

The Arkansas State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue promoting more inclusive practices. A target of the SIG is to analyze if students in schools participating in Goal 1: Literacy, are moving from a more restrictive environment to a lesser restrictive environment. The SIG will continue tracking the LRE of students participating in Goal 1 Literacy. Through the SEU partnership with the ADE K-12 Literacy Unit, SIG activities will incorporate a more targeted focus on adolescent literacy by providing professional development and follow-up to secondary educators (general and special education) in the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), with an ultimate goal of all students successfully accessing the general education curriculum.

Additionally, in support of LRE, the State Program Development (SPD) Section of the SEU will coordinate and conduct training for higher education teacher preparation faculty to assist with the support, services, and trainings for universities, public school, and higher education educators, and others for the systemic change for inclusion. To prepare pre-service teachers to meet the needs of children with IEPs, the inclusion of specific instructional strategies in teacher preparation curricula training needs to be provided to higher education teacher preparation faculty in a comprehensive, systemic manner. Research based strategies, Content Enhancement Routines, and Learning Strategies Routines developed by the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning (KU-CRL) will be utilized as the primary comprehensive intervention model. The intervention model is called the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). To implement the training, all 18 of Arkansas Colleges of Education in collaboration with Colleges of Arts and Sciences preparing teacher educators will receive an application for participation in the initial four day training, with two days of follow up. There will be eight teams of four faculty members comprised of two general

educators and two special educators selected to attend this comprehensive, systemic intervention model training. Fulfilling this goal will dramatically increase the capacity of the State's teacher training institutions to prepare future teachers to use research-based practices for adolescents.

The SEU will participate in the ADE's Closing the Achievement Gap (CTAG) initiative which is broadly formulated on an infrastructure aligned with a problem solving decision-making model and response to intervention design.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008) The ADE will continue to use LRE indicators as part of the monitoring system, as well as provide technical assistance and oversee noncompliance for districts that trigger. Districts that trigger are required to include an action plan in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). In addition, the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section will review each ACSIP and work with districts to ensure they are calculating the percentage of time accurately.

Arkansas will continue with the Arkansas Co-Teaching Project which has provided professional development to 189 schools over the past five years.

Arkansas will continue with the SIM project in partnership with the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning to prepare pre-service teachers to meet the needs of children with IEPs.

The Arkansas State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue tracking the LRE of students in schools participating in Goal 1 Literacy activities. An activity of the SIG is to support Goal 1 schools in their efforts to transition children with IEPs from a more restrictive environment to a lesser restrictive environment.

Through the SEU partnership with the ADE K-12 Literacy Unit, SIG activities will incorporate a more targeted focus on adolescent literacy by providing professional development and follow-up to secondary educators (general and special education) in the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), with an ultimate goal of all students accessing the general education curriculum. In particular, SIM Content Enhancement Routines involve planning instruction and teaching content to a diverse group of students in the general education classroom, meeting both group and individual needs. Providing teachers with the research based tools needed to ensure all students receive explicit instruction in what is most critical in the various content areas should have a positive impact on Arkansas' effort to improve LRE for students with disabilities.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students access the general curriculum.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009) The ADE will continue to use LRE indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. Districts that trigger are required to include an action plan in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). In addition, the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section will review each ACSIP and work with districts to ensure they are calculating the percentage of time accurately.

The Arkansas State Improvement Grant (SIG) will continue tracking the LRE of students in schools participating in Goal 1 Literacy activities. An activity of the SIG is to support Goal 1 schools in their efforts to transition children with IEPs from a more restrictive environment to a lesser restrictive environment.

SIG activities will continue to focus on adolescent literacy by providing professional development and follow-up to secondary educators (general and special education) in SIM.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

The SEU staff continues to participate as members of the ADE Closing the Achievement Gap Initiative in an effort to ensure all Arkansas students access the general curriculum.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010) The ADE will continue to use LRE indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. Districts that trigger are required to include an action plan in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). In addition, the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section will review each ACSIP and work with districts to ensure they are calculating the percentage of time accurately.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

ADE will continue to focus on improving student achievement building upon efforts originally associated with SIG activities, contingent upon availability of funds.

Smart Accountability is Arkansas' new system of differentiated accountability for schools. Approved by the U.S. Department of Education in January, 2009, Smart Accountability allows for varying labels and interventions for schools placed in "school improvement" status under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. This new approach will allow the department to support school administrators in most effectively choosing and applying interventions to address student achievement needs in their schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011) The ADE will continue to use LRE indicators as part of the monitoring system, providing technical assistance and oversight to districts that trigger. Districts that trigger are required to include an action plan in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). In addition, the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section will review each ACSIP and work with districts to ensure they are calculating the percentage of time accurately.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 06: Preschool LRE
Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (settings are early childhood, home, part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education, and reverse mainstream) (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

A four-year moving average was used to estimate preschool LRE through 2011. Variability in estimates is, in part, an artifact of historical data quality as well as the methodology. As data quality improves, more rigorous targets will be set.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Children 3-5 years of age with disabilities are educated with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. Research has shown that children with disabilities who are educated with their nondisabled peers acquire knowledge and skills more readily than children with disabilities NOT educated with their nondisabled peers. Failure to expose children with disabilities to their typically developing peers slows their developmental and educational progress.

The ADE-SEU works collaboratively with other State agencies and organizations, through memoranda of understanding (MOU), to ensure that children receiving early childhood special education are being served in the most inclusive educational environment. There is ongoing coordination with DHS Division of Developmental Disabilities Services with regard to identification of and services to children 3-5 years of age. The SEU, the Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education, and the Head Start Collaboration Office will coordinate with the Child Care Law Center National Inclusion Project to bring to the state information about the legal frameworks of the ADA and IDEA as they pertain to child care and early childhood education.

Systems collaboration is ongoing with agencies on the following initiatives:
- Arkansas Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems Initiative (Early Care and Education; Social/Emotional Needs of Young Children; Medical Home; Family Support and Parent Education)
- Assuring Better Child Health Development (ABCD)
- Arkansas Better Chance for School Success State Rules and Regulations insuring specific guidelines concerning children with special needs

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews early childhood LRE data via the program profile to ascertain an EC program's status with regard to LRE. To address the localized concerns about LRE, the monitoring staff works with the EC programs to develop a corrective action plan.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)
Percent = number of children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 60.13%

In 2005, 60.13% of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services were served in settings with typically developing peers. Preschool children with IEPs served in early childhood settings were 19.3%, while 39.6% were served in part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education. Children served at home were 0.56%, while 0.67% was served in reverse mainstream settings.

Children served in "Other Settings" included 6.15% in early childhood special education settings, 7.14% in itinerant services outside the home, less than 1% in residential and 26.5% in separate school.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	In 2004-05, early Childhood educational settings were static in the percentage of preschool children with IEPs served in special education settings, part-time early childhood/part-time special education early childhood, home, and reverse mainstream when compared to 2003-04. The "Other Settings" category has an upward trend, with the greatest increase being seen in separate school. The population of separate school facilities increased 23% in 2005. These facilities are licensed through the Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services Division of Developmental Disabilities Services (DDS) and through an interagency agreement with the ADE to provide IDEA special education and related services to these children. The DDS eligibility requirements are more stringent than the Arkansas IDEA eligibility requirements; therefore, children eligible for DDS services are also IDEA eligible. The ADE continues to work closely with DDS to insure these children served in separate school facilities are appropriately placed.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 63.35%.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 63.85%.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 64.33%.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 64.91%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 64.11%.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Percent = number of preschool children with IEPs receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total number of preschool children with IEPs times 100: 64.30%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   In 2005-06, the ADE began negotiations with the DHHS DDS agency on a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to strengthen the linkage between DDS and LEAs in the delivery of IDEA preschool services. A key component of the MOU clarifies the process of placement and educational services by stating that

> The parties have a common interest in providing preschool children with IEPs, ages 3 to 5, with a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment and that, to the maximum extent appropriate, preschool children with IEPs are educated with children who are nondisabled and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of preschool children with IEPs from the regular educational environment will occur only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

The Arkansas Department of Education, Special Education Office, and the Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child Care and Early Childhood Education, began a collaborative effort to pilot a Behavior Intervention initiative in the 2005-2006 school year for preschool students served in the Arkansas Better Chance (ABC) for School Success statewide programs.

In FY 05-06, state funds were transferred to the ADE, Special Education Early Childhood Education appropriation, from the Arkansas Better Chance (ABC) program for at-risk preschool children to pilot a Behavior Intervention Program using regionally-based behavioral specialists as interventionists to facilitate the inclusion of challenging students, including preschool children with IEPs within the ABC programs. Early outcomes suggested that this was an effective program for early intervention that facilitated keeping challenging students from being expelled or dropped from these preschool programs due to behavioral issues.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE and DDS will continue to refine the agency coordination processes outlined in the 2005-06 MOU. The ADE will also develop strategies about instructional delivery designs in general education settings and programs that focus on classroom culture and conditions that positively impact student outcomes in a general education preschool setting. The ADE will also emphasize the development of knowledge and skills of special education and general education early childhood educators to facilitate student participation in general education settings.

Technology solutions to facilitate the movement of preschool students with IEPs from more restrictive to lesser restrictive settings will be implemented for access by preschool providers. Examples of this include the Early Childhood SEASWeb™ application and the web-based referral system ECSPEC. The referral system, the Early Childhood Special Education Coordination system, will facilitate information exchanges and rapid referrals between general education and special education settings.

Early childhood educational environments will be added to the APSCN special education early childhood module. The data will be collected for the first time in December 2006.

Furthermore, in 2006-07, the DDS programs will report all data directly to ADE via Internet through the MySped Resource application in coordination with the IDEA Data & Research Office at UALR.

In FY 06-07, through the continuing collaboration between state agencies, ADE has funded and deployed a uniform statewide cadre of early childhood behavior intervention specialists supported by state funds to support Arkansas Better Chance (ABC) programs in the areas of behavioral early identification, training in

the use of the DECA, direct support to teachers in the areas of classroom interventions and modifications, and coordination of any needed mental health care for the child and family.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   Indicator Six is currently not being reported; however, the ADE continues to provide training around early childhood LRE. The early childhood LRE baseline data will be revised in 2007-08 to reflect the changes in federal educational environments, subject to final OSEP guidance. This change will result in new targets for this indicator.

Phase II of the Inclusion training, (Phase I took place in 2006-07) will be rolled out to regular child care providers between July and November 2007. Six regional trainings will be provided throughout the state.

The third phase of the Inclusion training will be developed and begin implementation in the spring of 2008. This training will address the roles and responsibilities of the regular early childhood teacher as an IEP team member under IDEA. This training will be ongoing.

EC Outcomes training will be conducted by Arkansas' 619 Coordinator and a local EC Coordinator on the preschool regulations at the Arkansas Special Education Early Childhood Professionals Fall Conference (2007). There will be approximately 200 in attendance.

The ADE and DDS will implement fully the agency coordination processes outlined in the 2005-06 MOU.

The ADE will take the lead in the implementation of special education instructional delivery strategies in general education settings and in programs designed to develop knowledge and skills transfers between preschool special educators and general education teachers and providers. The ADE will also further refine technology solutions for preschool education programs.

Arkansas will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE and DDS will follow the agency coordination processes outlined in the 2005-06 MOU. The ADE will take the lead in the implementation of special education instructional delivery strategies in general education settings and in programs designed to develop knowledge and skills transfers between preschool special educators and general education teachers and providers. The ADE will also further refine technology solutions for preschool education programs.

Implementation of Phase III of the Inclusion training will continue in the fall of 2008. This training will address the roles and responsibilities of the regular early childhood teacher as an IEP team member under IDEA. This training is ongoing.

The ADE/619 staff will provide six regional trainings to the DDTCS programs on rules and regulations that are required for general supervision under IDEA.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE and DDS will follow the agency coordination processes outlined in the 2005-06 MOU. The ADE will take the lead in the implementation of special education instructional delivery strategies in general education settings and in programs designed to develop knowledge and skills

transfers between preschool special educators and general education teachers and providers. The ADE will also continue to refine technology solutions for preschool education programs.

The ADE/Special Education Staff and the DHS/ EI Staff will jointly provide Training for all EI and EC programs on Early Childhood Outcomes in the summer of 2009 as part of the Data Summit, and EC Transition training is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2009.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE and DDS will follow the agency coordination processes outlined in the 2005-06 MOU. The ADE will take the lead in the implementation of special education instructional delivery strategies in general education settings and in programs designed to develop knowledge and skills transfers between preschool special educators and general education teachers and providers. The ADE will also continue to refine technology solutions for preschool education programs.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 07: Preschool Outcomes
Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

A) Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
  a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers = number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

  If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B) Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):
  a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
  d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

    e.   Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers = number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

        If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100% explain the difference.

C) Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

    a.   Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

    b.   Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

    c.   Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

    d.   Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same aged peers = number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

    e.   Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers = number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

        If $a + b + c + d + e$ does not sum to 100% explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

In Arkansas, the majority of the 10,007 preschool children with IEPs ages three to five in the 2002- 2003 school year were served in a variety of settings ranging from preschool classrooms on public school campuses, Head Start programs, private and public preschool programs, daycare centers, and in home settings using an itinerant teacher/facilitator model. Similarly, the 3,021 Part C infants and toddlers (2002-2003 year) received Early Intervention Services (EI) in a variety of settings.

The report *Getting Ready for School - Children, Families, Schools, Communities, Arkansas 2003*, developed by the Arkansas School Readiness Initiative Team revealed:

- Arkansas does not require childcare providers who care for children in their homes to have any prior early childhood training;
- Teachers in childcare centers can start work without prior early childhood training;
- Only 18.6 % of the licensed early care and education programs meet the State's quality approval/state accreditation standards; and
- On the Arkansas Benchmark Exams, only 69% of children were at or above the required proficiency level in Fourth Grade Reading and Writing Literacy.

Based on the demographic data presented above, it is evident that Arkansas' children are greatly at risk and in need of quality services in the early years to prepare them adequately for later school success. The need for quality services has a greater impact on preschool children with IEPs. Although Arkansas has been nationally recognized for having infant and toddler and early childhood quality standards, it has been criticized for the fact that so few children have access to programs that meet these standards.

In 2004, the Early Childhood Education Task Force of the Arkansas Early Childhood Commission revised the *Arkansas Early Childhood Education Framework Handbook for Three and Four Year Old Children (AECE).* Initially developed in 1995 to guide preschool curriculum, the *AECE Framework Handbook* is comprised of three sections: AECE Frameworks for three and four year olds; benchmark with strategies and activities; and a developmental rating scale. Arkansas requires preschool programs, including early childhood special education programs, to utilize a comprehensive curriculum. A comprehensive curriculum addresses all *AECE Frameworks* developmental learning strands. Any curriculum chosen must align with the *AECE Frameworks.* With all programs required to use aligned curricula, Arkansas is able to align the early childhood outcomes to a standard of developmental learning.

One of the encouraging factors is that the services are provided where the children are located. But the variation and the lack of consistency among the program offerings accentuate the need for developing a set of precise indicators for measuring child, family, and personnel outcomes across all programs and the impact of services on child outcomes. The need to create a standard of proof to ensure that EI (Early Intervention) and EC (Early Childhood) programs are effective in meeting the needs of children and their families is a challenge facing early childhood intervention professionals in Arkansas.

Because of the State's experience with EI and EC data limitations in the recent APR submissions, the State became cognizant of the need to move more aggressively to establish measurable, accountable systems for assessing performance and compliance, and in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvement strategies. Therefore, the EI and EC lead agencies jointly submitted a proposal for a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) in 2004 to establish not only a joint EI/EC long-term system goal but also the ability to measure the system's performance with respect to these goals.

Through the GSEG, the ADE and Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services (ADHHS) oversaw the development of the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and EC IEP web-based applications. The steering- and sub-committees have adopted birth to five child outcomes, aligned the outcomes to the Arkansas Infant Toddler Frameworks and the Early Childhood Frameworks, and are undertaking the identification of assessment tools that meet Arkansas' needs.

In 2005, Arkansas received a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to address Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) and adopted three of the birth to five outcomes recommended by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. The Outcomes system under development includes a seamless IFSP and IEP web-based application (Special Education Automated System (SEAS™)), which will incorporate the outcome measurement collection tool.

The measurement will incorporate a
- norm referenced or criterion referenced assessment aligned to the Arkansas Infant Toddler and Early Childhood Frameworks;
- teacher observation and perception which includes the special education teacher, general education teacher, and speech therapist; and
- related services providers observations and perceptions which includes physical therapists, occupational therapists, and behavioral/mental health professionals.

Arkansas has not selected a single assessment for early childhood programs to use. Programs can use any norm referenced or criterion referenced assessment aligned to the Arkansas Infant Toddler and Early Childhood Frameworks; further, all programs are required to use the ECO Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) as directed in Commissioner's Memo LS-07-042 (http://arkedu.state.ar.us/commemos/). The Commissioner's Memo outlined the following instructions regarding Indicator 07.

1. All Part B Early Childhood agencies will use the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) to develop and assign child-specific Outcomes ratings. The COSF and instructions can be downloaded from the Special Education website at http://arksped.k12.ar.us by clicking on the Direct Services for Students and Families link on the navigation panel on the left. From the Direct Services Support page, access the Early Childhood link. The COSF posted at this link is available in an editable format for ease of use by Arkansas Part B Early Childhood agencies.

2. Part B Early Childhood agencies will use the process learned at the August 17, 2006, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center training to determine child-specific Outcomes, to include the formation of an appropriate team and the utilization of appropriate assessments and other data.

3. The entry Outcomes ratings must be developed and assigned within thirty (30) days of entry into the program. The exit Outcomes ratings must be developed and assigned within thirty (30) days of exit (as long as the duration of preschool services was for six [6] months or more). For preschool children entering a Part B program, the ADE recommends that data derived from full and individual initial evaluations be used whenever possible to establish child-specific entry ratings scores.

4. For federal reporting purposes, COSF consensus ratings must be developed and submitted by Part B Early Childhood agencies for any preschool children with IEPs who enters or exits (as long as the duration of preschool services was for six [6] months or more). In addition, as provided for in the State Performance Plan, the ADE will collect and evaluate Outcomes data from all Part B Early Childhood agencies on at least an annual basis. Part B Early Childhood agencies, therefore, should prepare to implement the COSF consensus ratings process for each child at appropriate intervals throughout the school year.

5. COSF consensus ratings scores for each child and each Outcomes indicator must be reported through the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) Early Childhood module. Part B Early Childhood agencies are encouraged to also record child-specific scores in the local automated systems.

6. When a Part C agency has used the COSF to assign an exit rating to a child, the Part B Early Childhood agency may use this as an entry score unless there is consensus evidence that the rating and score are not valid.

7. Each Part B Early Childhood agency must develop a strategy for including parents in the determination of Outcomes scores.

The COSF data are submitted to the State in June each year via the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) or MySped Resource DDS Application. The data collected includes:

- entry assessment date and COSF score for each outcome;
- exit assessment date and COSF score for each outcome along with a "Y" or "N" indication of improvement; and
- exit date from special education services with an exit code of NS – No longer requires services or KE – Kindergarten Eligible.

Dates are cross referenced to ensure that a child has received at least six months of services before being included in the progress data set for the indicator. The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office at the University of Arkansas in Little Rock will then undertake analysis of the data to meet federal reporting requirements.

ADE will continue to work with Computer Automation Systems, Inc. to incorporate EC Outcomes into the web-based SEAS™ application to ensure continuity of scoring and comparability across the State. In addition the electronic system will allow for a child's IFSP or IEP to transfer with the child to a new service provider within Part C or Part B, including their previous scoring for the three outcomes. This functionality will keep a child's entire information together; allow seamless tracking throughout the child's time in

special education; decrease the delay time in forwarding IFSP and IEP to a receiving program, and create a complete service history.

Baseline Data:

The following are initial progress data; however States are not required to report actual baseline and targets until February 2010.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	46	2.79%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	122	7.41%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	415	25.20%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	515	31.27%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	549	33.33%
Total	N= 1,647	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	46	2.79%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	128	7.77%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	536	32.54%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	592	35.94%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	344	20.89%
Total	N= 1,646	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	30	1.82%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	72	4.37%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	291	17.67%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	520	31.57%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	730	44.32%
Total	N= 1,643	100%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Initial entry baseline data for this indicator was collected statewide through the Special Education MySped Resource website. The IDEA Data & Research office conducted web-based trainings with the early childhood programs about reporting entry baseline data on the three functional outcomes. Each early childhood program providing special education services was required to report on each child referred and placed during 2005-06. The information collected included child demographics, as well as the child's entry age level status (yes or no) for the three outcomes. A total of 4,789 children with IEPs were reported with baseline entry data • 48.1% of preschool children with IEPs were reported as being at age level upon entry for the early childhood outcome "positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)"; • 30.4% of children with IEPs were reported as being at age level upon entry for the early childhood outcome "acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)"; • 50.1% of children with IEPs were reported as being at age level upon entry for the early childhood outcome "use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs." On October 1, 2004, the ADE Special Education Unit was awarded an IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to create a statewide Early Childhood Special Education outcomes system in collaboration with DDS. The system for infants and toddlers (Part C) and for preschoolers with disabilities (Part B) will improve effectiveness of early intervention and preschool services and ensure smooth transition of children and families from Part C to Part B preschool services. With the AR GSEG steering committee guidance, the outcome measurement system for the early childhood programs continues to move forward to improve effectiveness of early intervention and preschool services. Data from the pilot programs has been collected and evaluated; Statewide Part B and C transition training was provided in the spring '06; and the ECO Center provided reliable outcomes training using the Child Outcome Summary Form in August '06 for Parts B and C programs. In addition, evidence statements and measurement approaches based on the revised ECOC recommendations for reporting data at the child level and the State level were provided. **GSEG Early Childhood Outcomes Pilot Study** In 2004, Arkansas was awarded a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) focusing on early childhood outcomes. The grant is a collaboration of Part C and Part B lead agencies, DHHS, and ADE respectively. As part of the grant, Arkansas conducted a pilot study using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center seven-point summary form. The study protocol included two early intervention programs and two early childhood programs. The pilot site administrators were also part of the GSEG steering committee and served as trainers to pilot site staff. The training covered the concepts of functional outcomes measurement and data collection. Each site was to collect outcomes data from teachers, related service providers, and parents on 50 children who were referred and placed between July 1, 2005 and June 30,

2006. Children must have received services for a minimum of six months to be part of the study. Data forms were due to the IDEA Data & Research Office for analysis by July 15, 2006. The data analysis was based on four criteria:

- Maintained or reached age level;
- Made gains on age level;
- Did not make gains on age level but made personal progress; and
- Did not make gains on age level or personal progress.

Pilot Study Outcomes:

The EC Outcome pilot study revealed the following on each of the functional outcomes.

- Parents tend to give their children higher functional scores than special education providers (teachers and related service providers). Parents also tend to evaluate more children as not improving over the 6-month review period than special education teachers;
- The curriculum based assessment (CBA) and teacher scoring show similar patterning. Both identify more EC children as reaching or maintaining age level and more EI children as gaining on age level. Special education teachers tend to evaluate a slightly lower percentage of students as reaching or maintaining age level and a slightly higher percentage of students as gaining on age level than general education teachers;
- A comparison of the teacher assessment average percentages and the overall total assessment averaged percentages revealed a variance of three percentage points, demonstrating that when observed as a whole, assessment scores are generally similar across evaluators; and
- A higher percentage of EI children show no improvement under the positive social relationship outcome. This may be a result of less social interaction due to age, or the outcome may be harder to evaluate with younger children. Across the board, EI children are more likely to be evaluated as showing no improvement. Once again, this may be due to age, maturity level, and/or fewer life experiences in general. Additionally, EI children may be more difficult to evaluate than older EC children.

A look into functional level advancement across evaluators shows that no less than 39% of all children assessed jumped three levels or more [on the seven point scale] over the 6-month evaluation period. Over 50% of the children evaluated by their parents were shown to advance three or more functional levels within the review period.

Functional scores, which increased by three or more levels during the 6-month evaluation period, raised questions as to why such an extreme advancement in functionality would occur over a short period of time. These questions include:

- Was the child's initial assessment underscored?
- Was the child's 6-month assessment over-scored?
- Were the outcome definitions, functional scale, and assessment instructions clearly defined and understood by all those involved in conducting the evaluations? If not, at which point did the communication between administrators and evaluators fail? How can this communication be improved for future assessments?

These are questions to be considered in future studies. It is extremely rare and unexpected for children with disabilities to improve at such a dramatic rate in such a short period of time. However, within a 6-month observation period, one would expect this type of advancement

	to be rare if altogether non-existent. Therefore, questions as to why these extreme jumps in functional scores occurred should be raised and addressed when designing and conducting future assessment studies. Finally, as part of the study there was to be a staff training survey in Spring 2006. The survey was not completed due to the ADE computer network restricting public access to the special education website for more than 2 months. Instead the pilot site administrators reported on challenges in training and implementing the data collection at the GSEG steering committee meeting. The greatest challenge identified was shifting the teacher and service provider's frame of reference from the developmental domains areas to functional outcomes.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	The data collection is based on a census of all children with IEPs who had both entry and exit COSF scores, left early childhood special education because they no longer required services or were kindergarten eligible, and received at least six months of services. A total of 1,647 children met the criteria. The total "N" for each outcome area is slightly different due to programs not submitting information on all outcomes for each child at exit. Data were analyzed for inconsistencies and EC programs were contacted if questions arose or data corrections needed to be addressed. In addition, M/PE Section has incorporated a review of COSF protocols into the monitoring process to assist in the validation and reliability of data across programs. Monitoring of EC programs in 2006-07 found that programs are embracing the outcomes with many assessing them every year, not only at entry and exit, to assist in developing the IEP for the next year. Analyses of the initial progress data collected during the 2006-07 school year revealed that the majority of children with IEPs are functioning at a level nearer, reaching, or maintaining to those of same-age peers across all outcome areas. The greatest amount of improvement was seen in "Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills" with almost 36% of children with IEPs reaching functional levels comparable to same age peers and an additional 32.5% of children with IEPs moving to a level nearer to same age peers. This is an important gain, for this particular outcome had the least number of children with IEPs already functioning at a level comparable to same age peers. In 2006-07, the data collection was added to the APSCN Special Education Module as part of the Early Childhood sub-Module for education co-ops and districts. A new web-based application was created for the 3-5 program operated under an interagency agreement with the Department of Human Services Division of Developmental Disabilities Services (DDS). The DDS application is part of MySped Resource, a secure data collection and review tool on the special education website. The DDS application allows the 3-5 programs to enter data directly to ADE and track children with IEPs (enrollment/child count information, EC outcomes, and EC exits) as well as referrals which include Part C to B transition. Mandatory training was held for co-ops and districts submitting COSF data through APSCN as well as for DDS 3-5 programs that are required to submit their data in the DDS application through MySped Resource. It is anticipated that the number of children with IEPs with both entry and exit COSF scores will increase in 2007-08. This will be the second full year of determining COSF scores at entry and exit, thus increasing the pool of children with more than six-months of services. Many of these children would have received 2 years of services by the end of the 2007-08 school year.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	In 2007-08, 3,823 children exited early childhood special education with both entry and exit COSF scores and met the Indicator criteria because they no longer required services or were kindergarten eligible, and received at least six months of services. The "N" for B and C is 100% congruent, and the congruency with A is 98.82%, which does not constitute a significant difference. This difference appears due to programs not submitting information on all outcomes for each child at exit. Data were analyzed for inconsistencies and EC programs were contacted if questions arose or data corrections needed to be addressed.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	78	2.04%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	175	4.58%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	907	23.72%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,383	36.18%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,207	31.57%
Total	N= 3,823	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	72	1.88%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	221	5.78%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,153	30.16%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,595	41.72%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	709	18.55%
Total	N= 3,778	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	68	1.78%
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	124	3.24%
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	607	15.88%
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,437	37.59%
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,514	39.60%
Total	N= 3,778	100%

Summary of Progress Data

Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

There were 3,823 children with entry and exit assessment data, of which 67.75% reached or maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers. This is a higher rate than the previous cohort of children. While 23.72% improved functioning nearer to same age peers, 4.58% made personal gains but failed to improve functioning nearer to same age peers. Only 2.04% of children did not improve functioning.

Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)

There were 3,788 children with entry and exit assessment data, of which 60.27% reached or maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers. This is a 3.46 percentage points higher than the previous cohort of children. While 30.16% improved functioning nearer to same age peers, 5.78% made personal gains but failed to improve functioning nearer to same age peers. Only 1.88% of children did not improve functioning.

Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

There were 3,823 children with entry and exit assessment data, of which 77.19% reached or maintained functioning at a level comparable to same age peers, a slight increase from the previous cohort of children. While 15.88% improved functioning nearer to same age peers, 3.24% made personal gains but failed to improve functioning nearer to same age peers. Only 1.78% of children did not improve functioning.

The data reveals that children make their greatest gains in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs followed by positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) and struggle the most with acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).

Throughout the year the IDEA Data & Research Office held web-based trainings and face-to-face trainings for early childhood programs on data collection, data entry, and reporting.

In accordance with the monitoring cycle, the M/PE staff reviewed child Outcomes and Assessments. Program staff was expected to review their data to identify professional development needs relative to improving child outcomes.

The Arkansas 619 Coordinator and a local EC Coordinator presented at the Arkansas Special Education Early Childhood Professionals Fall Conference. The presentation covered preschool regulations and the process for determining EC outcomes. Over 200 participants were in attendance.

The ADE Special Education Unit launched the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide

	professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Targets to be set in SPP due February 2010
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Targets to be set in SPP due February 2010
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Targets to be set in SPP due February 2010

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   In 2005-06 Arkansas will begin a pilot in two EI programs and four EC programs. The pilot sites will train staff in the concepts of outcomes measurement and will collect entry and annual assessment data on children served a minimum of six months. The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will analyze the staff training surveys and student data for anomalies, which can help guide the full implementation of the outcome system.

The assessment committee of the GSEG project will make a final recommendation on the EC assessment tool.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   Full training of EC programs on the outcomes and functional score determination will occur in August 2006. The Early Childhood Outcomes Center will conduct the mandatory statewide training as part of the contract with Arkansas under the GSEG. For the 2006-07 data collection, EC programs will use the curriculum based assessment tool of their choice.

The outcomes data collection will be added to the Early Childhood Module in APSCN. The DDS 3-5 programs, which do not use APSCN, will report child level outcomes data via the MySped Resource web-based application. Training on how to submit the required information will be held upon completion of the programming.

Training will be held for all EC programs on what is required for federal reports, how to record the data, and how to submit to ADE.

Early childhood outcomes are a key element of the Arkansas GSEG awarded in 2004-05. One of the last activities under the GSEG is the creation of an Early Childhood Outcomes training DVD available online through **Arkansas IDEAS. Arkansas IDEAS** is **I**nternet **D**elivered **E**ducation for **A**rkansas **S**chools provided by the Arkansas On-line Professional Development Initiative through a committed partnership of the Arkansas Educational Television Network and the Arkansas Department of Education.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   Preschool student outcomes and targets will continue to be incorporated into local programs and state General Supervision compliance monitoring.

Training will be held for all EC programs on what is required for federal reports, how to record the data, and how to submit to the ADE.

In accordance with the monitoring cycle, the M/PE staff will review child Outcomes and Assessments. Program staff will be expected to review their data to identify professional development needs relative to improving child outcomes.

The Arkansas 619 Coordinator and a local EC Coordinator will present at the Arkansas Special Education Early Childhood Professionals Fall Conference. The presentation will cover preschool regulations and the process for determining EC outcomes. Over 200 participants are expected to be in attendance.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   Preschool student outcomes and targets will be incorporated into local program self-assessments and state General Supervision compliance monitoring.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness section of the SEU will continue to review each child's Outcome and Assessment during onsite monitoring.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Training will be held for all EC programs on what is required for federal reports, how to record the data, and how to submit to ADE.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   Preschool student outcomes and targets will be incorporated into local program self-assessments and state General Supervision compliance monitoring.

Training will be held for all EC programs on what is required for federal reports, how to record the data, and how to submit to ADE.

The ADE/Special Education Staff and the DHS/ EI Staff will jointly provide training for all EI and EC programs on Early Childhood Outcomes in the summer of 2009 as part of the Data Summit, and EC Transition training is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2009.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   Preschool student outcomes and targets will be incorporated into local program self-assessments and state General Supervision compliance monitoring.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Training will be held for all EC programs on what is required for federal reports, how to record the data, and how to submit to ADE.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 08: Parent Involvement

Percent of parents with a child receiving special education who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement

Percent = Number of respondent parents who report school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

Parental involvement is essential for child success in acquiring knowledge and skills. Research has found that children acquire knowledge and skills at a greater rate when parents are involved in their child's education.

Each year, through the Program Effectiveness Evaluation Profile (PEEP), LEAs report on the number of parents who...

- were an active participant at their child's IEP meeting;
- indicate satisfaction with the special education program;
- believe their child has made progress;
- participated in at least one school activity related to educational performance (outside of special education); and
- participated in LEA in-service activities related to the education of children with disabilities.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

Statewide, a total of 8,791 surveys were collected with 8,220 of respondents reporting school/program facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Early Childhood: 1083/1306 = 82.92%
School Age: 7137/7485 = 95.35%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	A) **Early childhood programs:** 42 local education agencies with early childhood programs completed family outcome surveys for the 2005-06 school year. Overall, 1,306 surveys were collected, with 1,083 respondents or 82.92% reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Arkansas adopted three of the ECO Center's family outcomes: 1) Understanding your child's strengths, abilities, and special needs; 2) Knowing your rights and advocating for your child; and 3) Helping your child develop and learn. Questions 1-9 of the early childhood family survey focus on the three family outcomes. These questions serve a dual purpose. First, they measure family outcomes as adopted under the GSEG awarded to Arkansas in 2004. Second, they provide insight as to the level of parental involvement.

Anecdotally, one would state that early childhood programs that promote parental involvement will have parents who are better informed about their child's disability and their rights, and will have greater skills in helping their child develop and learn. Questions with answers scoring 5-7 were included in the calculation for Indicator 8. Additionally, question ten was added to the survey to provide a more direct link to the indicator. A copy of the survey is located in Appendix I.

Question 6 (89.2% agree) had the greatest amount of agreement and Question 7 (23.48% disagree) had the least amount of agreement.

B) **School age programs:** 211 local education agencies with special education school age programs completed family outcome surveys for the 2005-06 school year. Overall, 7,485 surveys were collected. Of those surveys, 7,137 respondents, or 95.35% reported school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Fifteen questions were selected from the NCSEAM family survey question bank felt to represent the measurement of Indicator 8. A copy of the survey is located in Appendix I. Questions 11 (94.89% agree) and 2 (94.18% agree) had the greatest level of agreement while Questions 13 (37.39% disagree) and 1 (30.03% disagree) had the least level of agreement.

In late March 2006, the IDEA Data & Research Office conducted trainings on the early childhood and school age family surveys for all local education agencies including DDS. Each LEA was given a secured password that would allow it to access the web-based family surveys.

While it was anticipated that the web-based surveys (English and Spanish) would be ready in early February 2006, delays in the translation to Spanish resulted in a late March release. Unfortunately, by that time, many of the LEAs had already completed their annual reviews and had to rely on mailing surveys to parents. The IDEA Data & Research Office provided embedded scan surveys along with return envelopes to LEAs upon request. Both the web-based and embedded scan forms of the survey were available in English and Spanish. No other languages have been added at this time.

Data collection for this indicator began in late March 2006 and ran through June 2006. In May 2006, the special education website became unavailable for over two months due to ADE network security restrictions, thus hampering the data collection procedures. Although the LEAs were unable to submit surveys electronically, those utilizing the scannable forms were able to submit the forms to the IDEA Data & Research Office for processing.

Arkansas State Improvement Grant activities in 2005-06 included hiring a State Parent Coordinator housed within the Arkansas PTI in a collaborative effort to oversee the SIG's parent outreach goals. As part of this process a parent mentor outreach project was developed. As of May 2006, a total of 173 parents have been identified as willing to participate in the Parent Mentoring Network. Specifically, during the first year of their involvement, the Parent Mentors will attend training and disseminate information regarding scientifically based strategies to promote literacy and positive behavior support in the home. With trainings held by the end of May 2006, during the second and third years of their involvement, Parent Mentors will become active mentors in their region—coaching, teaching,

	listening, and building bridges between the home and school.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	In 2005-06, many schools were unable to complete the EC and school age surveys because the schools had already completed their annual reviews when the surveys became available. Therefore, the number of surveys collected in 2006-07 is expected to increase. As a reflection of this increase, in 2006-07 Arkansas expects the percentage of parents reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities will increase for early childhood programs to 84.00% and decline to 93% for school age programs.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	The 2007-08, Arkansas anticipates the percentage of parents reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities in early childhood programs will continue to increase reaching a rate of 85.00%, while school age programs will increase slightly to 94.50%.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	In 2008-09, Arkansas expects the percentage of parents reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities in early childhood programs to increase to 86.00% and school age programs will reach 94.5%.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	In 2009-10, Arkansas expects the percentage of parents reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities in early childhood programs to increase to 87.00% and school age programs will reach 95.00%.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	In 2010-11, Arkansas expects the percentage of parents reporting school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities in early childhood programs to increase to 88.00% and school age programs will reach 96.00%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   In 2005-2006, a new web-based survey was developed to capture parent perceptions on school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The survey results provided LEAs with insights about how parent involvement can improve services and results for children with disabilities.

Arkansas utilized two surveys to capture parent involvement — the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's (ECO) family survey and fifteen questions from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) school age survey question bank. The surveys were accessible through the special education website to be answered at the time of annual reviews. The surveys were also available as an embedded scantron. This allowed parents who were unable to participate in their child's annual review to respond without Internet access. The embedded scantron questionnaire also made the survey available to parents who were attending the annual review in a location where Internet access was unavailable.

Both the web-based and the embedded scantron forms of the survey were available in English and Spanish. Other languages may be added if the need arises.

In March 2006, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office conducted trainings on the early childhood and school age family surveys for all local education agencies including DDS.

Data collection for this indicator began in late March 2006 and ran through June 2006. The website will be available throughout the year for survey submissions beginning in the 2006-2007 school year.

SIG activities will focus on building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral supports.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will use parent involvement surveys and results to evaluate local preschool and school age performance against state targets.

The web-based family surveys and scan forms will be available year round; therefore, data collection is an ongoing process.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct trainings on the EC and school age family surveys as part of the annual data submission training.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office, in cooperation with the Monitoring Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section, will analyze the family survey results from 2005-06 and issue a report to each LEA. The information will assist LEAs in enhancing their service delivery and interaction with family members.

To facilitate local program analysis the LEAs requested two new data fields—resident LEA and building code. The IDEA Data & Research Office will modify the web application and scan forms to meet the requests. In addition, family survey reports along with sub-reports based on resident LEA and building code will be developed for each early childhood and school district, respectively.

SIG activities will continue to focus on building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral support including recruitment for the parent mentor outreach project. Training modules will be developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs. These modules are designed to train a network of parents with children with disabilities to mentor other parents on working with their children at home in the areas of literacy and positive behavioral practices.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The M/PE Section, as part of its monitoring of LEAs, will review the process used by LEAs to survey parents to ensure families are provided the opportunity to participate. Since collecting the family survey data, programs have been advised to offer the survey at dismissal of services or annual review conference; thus, creating an opportunity for programs to document the offer as part of the conference.

The ADE will continue to use parent involvement surveys and results to evaluate local preschool and school age performance against state targets.

The web-based family surveys and scan forms will be updated to collect student race/ethnicity and disability for representative analysis, and will be available year round; therefore, data collection is an ongoing process.

The Administrator of M/PE will contact LEAs with low response rates individually as a reminder of the importance of the family involvement survey and expectations for improved outcomes.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct trainings on the EC and school age family surveys as part of the annual data submission training.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in cooperation with the M/PE Section will analyze the family survey results from 2006-2007 and issue a report to each LEA. The information will assist LEAs with enhancing their service delivery and interaction with family members.

SIG activities will continue to focus on building parent involvement through home-based literacy and positive behavioral support. Training modules developed through the SIG for parents of children with IEPs will be implemented by SIG parent mentors during the 2007-08 school year.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009) The ADE will continue to use parent involvement surveys and results to evaluate local preschool and school age performance against state targets. The ADE-SEU will provide written reminders to LEAs and EC programs of the need to survey parents as part of the annual review conferences held most frequently in the late winter and spring months of the school year, in an attempt to increase the overall participation and representation of parents of students with disabilities in the parent involvement survey. Reminders will be posted on the ADE website and MySped Resource, as well as in the IDEA Data & Research Newsletter and emails sent to these constituents.

The web-based family surveys will be available year round; therefore, data collection is an ongoing process.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct trainings on the EC and school age family surveys as part of the annual data submission training.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in cooperation with the M/PE Section will analyze the family survey results from 2007-2008 and issue a report to each LEA. The information will assist LEAs with enhancing their service delivery and interaction with family members.

The Administrator of M/PE will contact LEAs with low response rates individually as a reminder of the importance of the family involvement survey and expectations for improved outcomes.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010) The ADE will continue to use parent involvement surveys and results to evaluate local preschool and school age performance against state targets.

The web-based family surveys will be available year round; therefore, data collection is an ongoing process.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct trainings on the EC and school age family surveys as part of the annual data submission training.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in cooperation with the M/PE Section will analyze the family survey results from 2008-2009 and issue a report to each LEA. The information will assist LEAs with enhancing their service delivery and interaction with family members.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to use parent involvement surveys and results to evaluate local preschool and school age performance against state targets.

The web-based family surveys will be available year round; therefore, data collection is an ongoing process.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct trainings on the EC and school age family surveys as part of the annual data submission training.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in cooperation with the M/PE Section will analyze the family survey results from 2009-2010 and issue a report to each LEA. The information will assist LEAs with enhancing their service delivery and interaction with family members.

The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

The development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan began in May 2005 with the appointment of a 40-member stakeholder group. This group consisted of consumers, parents, school officials, legislators, and other interested parties. Initial orientations to the SPP were provided to the stakeholders group as well as to the State Advisory Panel in June 2005.

In July 2005, a half-day working session was conducted for members of the stakeholder group and the State Advisory Panel. After a brief orientation, members were assigned to one of three task groups focusing on the establishment of measurable, rigorous targets, strategies for improving performance, and steps necessary for obtaining broad-based public input. The recommendations and considerations generated by these task groups laid the foundation for the development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan (SPP).

After additional work to develop the content of the SPP around the 20 indicators, the SPP was presented to the State Advisory Panel in mid-October 2005 for its comments and modifications. Advisory Panel SPP changes were incorporated and presented to the 40-member stakeholder group in a series of conference calls in late October 2005.

Further changes, suggested by the stakeholder group, were made in November 2005 while additional data and targets were assembled. The SPP was posted on the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education website as a series of program area "mini-volumes" in mid-November 2005. Comments were solicited from the public on the SPP topics of FAPE in the LRE, pre- and post-school outcomes, child find, and special education over-representation.

Changes made to the SPP since its original dissemination are presented to the stakeholder group and State Advisory Panel. The feedback provided by these groups will be incorporated into the SPP for subsequent submissions.

Following the submission of the Arkansas APR on February 1, 2009, the Arkansas Department of Education - Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) will utilize the ADE-SEU website as the primary vehicle for the annual dissemination of the APR on progress or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets. Additionally, e-version copies of the APR, along with an explanatory cover letter from the Arkansas Commissioner of Education, will be sent to the headquarters of each public library operating within the Arkansas public library system. Further, an official press release will be prepared and provided to all statewide media outlets detailing how the public may obtain or review a copy of the APR. Lastly, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will report annually to the public on each Local Education Agency's (LEA) performance against the SPP targets using the Special Education website as well as in an ongoing series of performance reports disseminated to statewide and local media outlets, primarily the print media.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 09: Disproportionality – Eligibility Category
Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement

Percent = number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices, and procedures under 618 (d), etc.

Historically, the State has only examined the disproportionate representation in regards to the over identification of black children with IEPs. SPP Indicators 9: Identification by Race/Ethnicity and Indicator 10: Disability by Race/Ethnicity require the State to examine all racial/ethnic groups for both over- and under-representation in the area of identification and six specific disabilities, respectively. Since the State has historically only examined child count data for over-representation of black students, the State is required to re-examine the 2005-06 child count for all racial/ethnic groups.

Disproportionality/Over-Representation
In order to demonstrate educational equity, relative to opportunity, services, and decision making, the racial/ethnic composition of children with IEPs in a school district should be proportionately similar to the racial/ethnic composition of all students in the district. Thus, it is important to ensure that students in a racial/ethnic group are not disproportionately represented in special education in contrast with the racial/ethnic groups of all students in the district.

Over-Representation
The methodology is based on a three-year average benchmark plus one standard deviation percentage point difference between special education and district enrollment for each racial/ethnic category resulting in a base value for each racial/ethnic group.

1.   Using the December 1 child count for the selected year, students were identified if they were receiving services in a private residential treatment program. These students were removed from the special education child count number and the district October 1 enrollment numbers for the selected year. The reason for excluding students in private residential treatment facilities is found in the State rules governing private residential treatment facilities. These rules state that a student belongs to the district where the facility is located; therefore, enrollment of such students artificially increases the district's special education child count and district wide enrollment.
2.   Once the October 1 enrollment and December 1 child count has been adjusted for private residential treatment students, the percentage of each racial/ethnic group in the district is calculated. If a racial/ethnic group within the district is less than 5% or more than 95%, that group is excluded in the district and children with IEPs counts. The district and the children with IEPs s counts are then summed by racial/ethnic group to generate statewide totals.
3.   Using the statewide totals for each racial/ethnic group the State percentage point difference is calculated by subtracting the adjusted State enrollment for each race/ethnicity from the adjusted

State special education racial/ethnic child count. This process is conducted for each of the three baseline years and is then averaged resulting in a 3-year average benchmark. In addition, a standard deviation is generated on the percentage point difference for each race/ethnic group for each of the 3 years. The 3-year average standard deviation is then added to the 3-year average benchmark to create a "base value."

Indicator 9: Identification
Disproportionality Over-Representation Calculation

	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White
Benchmark	0.040%	-0.065%	4.541%	-1.512%	-3.004%
Standard Deviation	0.451	0.554	8.611	3.875	9.972
Base Value	**0.491%**	**0.489%**	**13.152%**	**2.364%**	**6.968%**

Under Representation Base Value

The identification of districts for under-representation is based on the same methodology as over-representation. Under-representation takes the negative base value when adding the benchmark plus two standard deviations. Two standards deviations is used to account for the fact that districts' implementation of early intervention services (EIS) and response to intervention (RtI) programs can prevent or reduce special education placements. Therefore, two standard deviations helps to identify the extreme outlier cases.

Indicator 9: Identification
Disproportionality Under-Representation Calculation

	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White
Benchmark	0.040%	-0.065%	4.541%	-1.512%	-3.004%
Two Standard Deviations	0.902	1.108	17.222	7.750	19.944
Negative Base Value	**(0.942)** **-0.942%**	**(1.043)** **-1.043%**	**(21.76)** **-21.763%**	**(6.238)** **-6.238%**	**(16.940)** **-16.940%**

To ascertain if a district exceeds (+/-) the base values for disproportionality Indicator 9, enrollment and child count data were examined.

1. Using the December 1 child count for the selected year, students were identified if they were receiving services in a private residential treatment program. These students were removed from the children with IEPs count numbers and the district October 1 enrollment numbers for the selected year. The reason for excluding students in private residential treatment facilities is in the State rules governing private residential treatment facilities. These rules state that a student belongs to the district where the facility is located; therefore, enrollment of such students artificially increases the district's special education child count and district wide enrollment.

2. After the October 1 enrollment and December 1 child count have been adjusted for private residential treatment students, the percentage of each racial/ethnic group in the district is

calculated. If a racial/ethnic group within the district is less than 5% that group is excluded in the district and students with IEPs counts.

3. The district percentage point difference for each racial/ethnic group is then calculated by subtracting adjusted district enrollment for each race/ethnicity from the adjusted district special education race/ethnicity data. If the percentage point difference exceeds or falls below (+/-) the State base value for any racial/ethnic group then the district will be identified to conduct a self assessment to review its policies, procedures, and practices.

Formula:
(Special Education Racial/Ethnic group Percent – District Racial/Ethnic group Percent) =
Racial/Ethnic group Percentage Point Difference between Special Education and District

Example 1: DISPROPORTIONALITY-Over-Representation

% White – Special   30.00%
    Number of White Students with IEPs 60/200

12.58 (% point difference)

% White – District   17.42%
    Number of White Students in District 270/1,550

This district exceeds the base value for disproportionality of white students with IEPs since the percent point difference is greater than 6.968%

Example 2: DISPROPORTIONALITY-Under-Representation

% Hispanic – Special   2.50%
    Number of Hispanic Students with IEPs   5/200

-7.62 (% point difference)

% Hispanic – District   10.12%
    Number of Hispanic Students in District   157/1,550

This district exceeds the base value for disproportionality of Hispanic students with IEPs since the percent point difference is less than -6.238%

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Once a district is identified as being disproportionate in a racial/ethnic group a self assessment must be completed and submitted to the SEU Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section. The Disproportionality Self Assessment is a combination of a state developed document and the National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) document presented at the 2007 OSEP Leadership Conference. The Disproportionality Self Assessment is available on the special education website at http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/Dispro_self_assessment.doc.

The self assessment covers five procedural areas: intervention, referral, evaluation, placement, and procedural safeguards, as well as a review of policies, procedures, and practices effecting disproportionality. In addition, districts are required to submit evidence to support their responses. After receiving the self assessments in the M/PE section, the State Education Agency Supervisors (SEA-S) review the self assessment and supporting evidence for approval. If discrepancies or questions arise, the SEA-S contacts the district for clarification and may schedule a site visit prior to making a determination as to whether inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices led to the disproportionate representation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

Zero (0) percent of districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and a related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	A review of districts' Disproportionality Self Assessment and supporting evidence documents resulted in zero (0) percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification. For the 2005-06 school year, 33 districts were identified with over- and/or under-representation. Of the 33 districts identified, all racial/ethnic groups were represented with zero districts under identifying black or American Indian/Alaskan Native students and zero districts over identifying Asian/Pacific Islander students. Seventeen districts were identified as having over- and under-representation, five districts with under representation, and 11 districts with over-representation. Districts identified with over-representation may also be included in focused monitoring. Besides completing the Disproportionality Self Assessment, these districts must address the over-representation in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). These districts may also receive an on-site visit where any deficiencies in their policies, practices, and procedures are noted, if applicable, and corresponding corrective action plans (CAPS) are implemented to correct the noted deficiencies. Should sufficient evidence exist to demonstrate that a district is not providing free appropriate public education (FAPE) in accordance with the Act, the Associate Director will notify the district that the ADE intends to take the necessary steps to provide interventions in accordance with 34 CFR 300.600 and 300.604.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Focused Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will coordinate with the IDEA Data & Research Office to develop a protocol for identifying inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct a study to determine if school choice, residential treatment facilities, and students who transfer into a district have a direct effect on how the State determines disproportionate representation.

At the direction of the ADE, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will issue an RFP for the development of the Automated Monitoring Interface *(AMI™)* Software. This software will interact with the Computer Automation Systems, Inc. program Special Education Automated System, SEAS™, an electronic IEP program used by school districts in the State. The *AMI™* software allows remote electronic compliance monitoring of IEPs.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The State M/PE Section will incorporate the protocol for identifying inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices into the Monitoring Procedural Handbook.

The State M/PE Section will incorporate a district disproportionality self assessment into the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the final implementation of the *AMI™* software.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in conjunction with the M/PE Section will revise the State's disproportionality methodology to include all racial/ethnic groups for over- and under-representation.

The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Focused Monitoring Profiles.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct a study of the 2005-06 school age referral tracking data using weighted risk ratios to examine racial/ethnic trends in placing students in special education.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis, including child count, and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will incorporate a district disproportionality self assessment into the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the final implementation of the *AMI™* software.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI™* software as a means to review desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to review desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

Dr. Jody Fields, Director Arkansas IDEA Data and Research will present "The Ins and Outs of Disproportionality: Understanding the Federal Requirements," March 2, 2009. The workshop will explain the difference between disproportionality in the Annual Performance Report and Coordinated Early Intervening Services.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to review desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to review desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Disproportionality – Child with a Disability

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement

Percent = number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Historically, the State has only examined disproportionate representation with regard to the over identification of black students receiving special education. SPP Indicators 9: Identification by Race/Ethnicity and Indicator 10: Disability by Race/Ethnicity require the State to examine all racial/ethnic groups for both over- and under-representation in the area of identification and six specific disabilities, respectively. Since the State has historically only examined child count data for over-representation of black students, the State is required to re-examine the 2005-06 child count for all racial/ethnic groups.

To identify disproportionate race/ethnic representation by disability category, Arkansas uses Westat's Weighted Risk Ratio application. However, the State has applied its own criteria in applying the weighted risk ratio.

Over- and Under-Representation in a Disability Category

There are six disability categories that must be examined under Indicator 10─Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Mental Retardation, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and Speech Language Impairment. A weighted risk ratio methodology was used to determine if a district has disproportionate representation within the six disabilities. However, the district enrollment and special education child count data were examined and adjusted according to the following criteria.

1. Using the December 1 child count for the selected year, students were identified if they were receiving services in a private residential treatment program. These students were removed from the special education child count numbers and the district October 1 enrollment numbers for the selected year. The reason for excluding students in private residential treatment facilities is in the State rules governing private residential treatment facilities. These rules state that a student belongs to the district where the facility is located; therefore, enrollment of such students artificially increases the district's special education child count and district wide enrollment.
2. After the October 1 enrollment and December 1 child count have been adjusted for private residential treatment students, weighted risk ratios were generated for each of the six disability categories.
3. Some weighted risk ratios were considered invalid if (1) the district enrollment of a racial/ethnic group is less than 5% or (2) the number of students in a disability category was below 40. The 5% criteria falls in line with Indicator 9 and an "n" of 40 is the same number used for adequate yearly progress (AYP) subgroups.

4. Once adjusted under the above criteria, weighted risk ratios greater than 4.00 and less than the inverse 0.25 were considered an over-representation and under-representation, respectively.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

Once a district is identified as being disproportionate in a disability category by racial/ethnic group a self assessment must be completed and submitted to the SEU Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section. The Disproportionality Self Assessment is a combination of a state developed document and the National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) document presented at the 2007 OSEP Leadership Conference. The Disproportionality Self Assessment is available on the special education website at http://arksped.k12.ar.us/documents/data_n_research/Dispro_self_assessment.doc.

The self assessment covers five procedural areas: intervention, referral, evaluation, placement, and procedural safeguards, as well as a review of policies, procedures, and practices effecting disproportionality. In addition, districts are required to submit evidence to support their responses. After receiving the self assessments in the M/PE Section, the State Education Agency Supervisors (SEA-S) review the self assessment and supporting evidence for approval. If discrepancies or questions arise, the SEA-S contacts the district for clarification and may schedule a site visit prior to making a determination as to whether inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices led to the disproportionate representation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

In 2005-06, zero (0) percent of districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were the result of inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	A review of district Disproportionality Self Assessment and supporting evidence documents, resulted in zero (0) percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were the result of inappropriate identification. For the 2005-06 school year, 45 districts were identified with over- and/or under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories when applying the State's criteria to the weighted risk ratios. Districts with weighted risk ratios greater then 4.00 were identified as having over representation and districts with weighted risk ratios lower than 0.25 identified as having under representation. Weighted risk ratios for under-representation varied from 0.24 to 0.17. The variance in over-representation is more widely dispersed with a low of 4.15 and a high of 57.64. Of the 45 districts identified for Indicator 10, 11 were also identified under Indicator 9; thus, illustrating how disproportionate representation in identification does not equate to disproportionate representation in a disability category. In the six primary disability categories two racial/ethnic groups in four disability categories were identified as having over- and/or under-representation. As illustrated in Exhibit I-10.1, white students are over- or under-identified in four disability categories, while black students are over-identified in one disability category.

Exhibit I-10.1: District Count of Disproportionate Representation for Disability by Racial/Ethnic Group 2005-06

	Autism		Emotional Disturbance		Mental Retardation		Other Health Impairment		Specific Learning Disability		Speech Impairment	
	Over	Under	Over	Under	Over	Under	Over	Under	Over	Under	Over	Under
American Indian												
Asian/Pacific Islander												
Black (non-Hispanic)					9							
Hispanic												
White (non-Hispanic)					5	2	4		19	4	7	1

The weighted risk ratios are provided to districts on their Focused Monitoring Profiles for their review. Districts may voluntarily address the over- or under-representation in their Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP).

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Zero (0) percent of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Focused Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will coordinate with the IDEA Data & Research Office to develop a protocol for identifying inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

In addition, the IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct a study to determine if school choice, residential treatment facilities, and students who transfer into a district have a direct effect on how the State determines disproportionate representation.

At the direction of the ADE, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will issue an RFP for the development of the Automated Monitoring Interface (AMI™) Software. This software will interact with the Computer Automation Systems, Inc. program Special Education Automated System, SEAS™, an electronic IEP program used by school districts in the State. The AMI™ software will allow remote electronic compliance monitoring of IEPs.

The ADE will expand the Focused Monitoring Profiles to include weighted risk ratios for the black, white, and Hispanic racial/ethnic groups.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of weighted risk ratios for all racial/ethnic groups by disability and present a report to the M/PE Section for monitoring considerations.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The State M/PE Section will incorporate the protocol for identifying inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices into the Monitoring Procedural Handbook.

The State M/PE Section will incorporate a district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the final implementation of the AMI™ software.

The State M/PE Section will test the use of the AMI™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Focused Monitoring Profiles.

The IDEA Data & Research Office in conjunction with the M/PE Section will revise the disproportionality methodology for the identification of disproportionate representation by racial/ethnic groups in a disability category.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the AMI™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office continue to oversee the final implementation of the AMI™ software.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to monitor districts for disproportionate representation using data reviews and analysis including child count and the monitoring priority indicators on the Monitoring Profiles.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the district disproportionality self assessment in the monitoring process for the identification of inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices leading to disproportionality.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

The development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan began in May 2005 with the appointment of a 40-member stakeholder group. This group consisted of consumers, parents, school officials, legislators, and other interested parties. Initial orientations to the SPP were provided to the stakeholders group as well as to the State Advisory Panel in June 2005.

In July 2005, a half-day working session was conducted for members of the stakeholder group and the State Advisory Panel. After a brief orientation, members were assigned to one of three task groups focusing on the establishment of measurable, rigorous targets, strategies for improving performance, and steps necessary for obtaining broad-based public input. The recommendations and considerations generated by these task groups laid the foundation for the development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan (SPP).

After additional work to develop the content of the SPP around the 20 indicators, the SPP was presented to the State Advisory Panel in mid-October 2005 for its comments and modifications. Advisory Panel SPP changes were incorporated and presented to the 40-member stakeholder group in a series of conference calls in late October 2005.

Further changes suggested by the stakeholder group were made in November 2005 while additional data and targets were assembled. The SPP was posted on the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education website as a series of program area "mini-volumes" in mid-November 2005. Comments were solicited from the public on the SPP topics of FAPE in the LRE, pre- and post-school outcomes, child find, and special education over-representation.

Changes made to the SPP since its original dissemination are presented to the stakeholder group and State Advisory Panel. The feedback provided by these groups will be incorporated into the SPP for subsequent submissions.

Following the submission of the Arkansas APR on February 1, 2009, the Arkansas Department of Education - Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) will utilize the ADE-SEU website as the primary vehicle for the annual dissemination of the APR on progress or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets. Additionally, e-version copies of the APR, along with an explanatory cover letter from the Arkansas Commissioner of Education, will be sent to the headquarters of each public library operating within the Arkansas public library system. Further, an official press release will be prepared and provided to all statewide media outlets detailing how the public may obtain or review a copy of the APR. Lastly, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will report annually to the public on each Local Education Agency's (LEA) performance against the SPP targets using the Special Education website as well as in an ongoing series of performance reports disseminated to statewide and local media outlets, primarily the print media.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 11: Child Find
Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who are evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline) (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

> **A)** Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received
>
> **B)** Number determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline)
>
> **C)** Number determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline)
>
> Account for children included in a, but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.
>
> Percent = (b + c) divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Timely evaluations are critical to ensure that all children determined eligible receive services as soon as possible.

Arkansas has incorporated into the APSCN a new referral tracking system that includes fields required to determine if evaluations were completed within the 60 day timeline. The fields include:
> Date parents consented to evaluate,
> Date evaluations were completed,
> Reason for delay: The program calculates the 60 days and if it exceeds the timeline a reason must be
>   selected, and
> Date eligibility was determined.

LEAs enter the information into the APSCN system as referrals are received. The information is then pulled each year in June during the APSCN cycle 7.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)
Measurement:
> **A)** Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received: 11,158
>
> **B)** Number determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline): 2,438
>
> **C)** Number determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline): 7,817

Account for children included in a, but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = (b + c) divided by a times 100 ((7817+2438)/11,158)*100) = 91.91%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	In 2005-06, 11,158 children with parent consent to evaluate were evaluated. The number of children evaluated within the State's 60-day timeline was 10,255 or 91.91%, of which 2,438 or 23.77% were determined not eligible while 7,817 or 76.23% were determined eligible. The evaluations of the remaining 903 students exceeded the 60-day timeframe with 650 determined eligible and 253 found not eligible. The number of days beyond the 60-day timeline ranged from 1 to 219. Reasons for exceeding the 60-day timeline are unclear, as this was not part of the initial data collection. However, Arkansas did collect reasons for the delay in eligibility determination, reflecting the previous version of the indicator, which included child or family illness, child unavailable, student transferred to another program, and evaluators failed to submit reports in a timely manner. Additionally, 93.21% of early childhood students with parent consent to evaluate were evaluated within the 60-day timeline. Similarly, 90.53% of school age students with parent consent to evaluate were evaluated within the 60-day timeline. As part of the monitoring procedures, the M/PE Section of the Special Education Unit (SEU) conducts file audits to ascertain if local districts are meeting timelines. Districts found failing to meet timelines are given a noncompliance CAP requiring a corrective action plan to be submitted. The SEA supervisor assigned to the local district assists in the development of the action plan. The *AMI*™ software developed in 2005-06, and being fully implemented in 2006-07, will provide the M/PE Section the means to monitor electronically school age student IEPs. Early childhood monitoring of due process timelines can also be conducted electronically, with consent from the program, through the SEASWeb early childhood IEP application developed as part of the Arkansas General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG). In reporting this indicator, Arkansas chose not to use monitoring data in 2005-06; instead, the referral tracking application was implemented as part of the special education module in APSCN. Training was held in August 2005 via a series of web teleconferences for the LEAs. Year one of the data collection created challenges for the LEAs and for data management with additional business logic being added to increase the accuracy of the data. Future activities surrounding the data collection will include 1) updating the referral tracking application to include reasons for the delays in evaluation, and 2) annual training with the LEAs. Since Indicator 11 was a new indicator in 2005-06, Arkansas did not expect to hit the 100% compliance target for the first year of data collection. During the process of analyzing the data, unforeseen yet logical data entry problems became apparent. To address said problems, additional business logic guidelines will be built into the APSCN and MySped Resource programming. These will be implemented to limit data errors encountered during the 2005-06 data collection period, which included incomplete data sets, conflicting dates, incorrect reporting of a child's placement within a special education program, and/or other such data entry errors.

	With the implementation of the new business logic programming, the percent of students meeting the evaluation timeline should see an increase in the 2006-07 school year. With improved and more strictly guided data entry, the percentage of districts meeting the Indicator 11 compliance should steadily increase until the 100% compliance target is met.
	One of the State Improvement Grant (SIG) targets for 2005-2006 was to reduce special education referrals. Both Cohort I (began SIG activities in 2004-2005) and Cohort II (began SIG activities in 2005-2006) show a marked decrease in the number of referrals for special education evaluation.
	Additionally, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office undertook a study and analyzed data gathered for this indicator, by school age and early childhood, to ascertain if there is a trend in disproportionate racial/ethnic identification. In reference to Indicators 9 and 10, if inappropriate identification is occurring, the referral due process seems the most logical timeframe to examine the possibilities. This study can further help identify inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices related to timely evaluations within the EC programs and school districts.
	Further, at the direction of the ADE, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office issued a Request for Proposals for the development of the Automated Monitoring Interface (AMI™) Software. This software interacted with the Computer Automation Systems, Inc. program Special Education Automated System, SEAS™, an electronic IEP program used by school districts in the State. The AMI™ software will allow remote electronic compliance monitoring of IEPs.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline).
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline).
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline).
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline).
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate are evaluated within 60 days (or the State established timeline).

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)　　The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office worked with the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) to ensure that all children data elements for reporting this indicator were in the special education module by developing a new referral-tracking component.

The ADE monitored districts for child find activities to ensure due process. The State M/PE Section coordinated with the IDEA Data & Research Office to develop a protocol for identifying inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices related to timely evaluations.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office undertook a study and analyzed data gathered for this indicator, by school age and early childhood, to ascertain if there is a trend in disproportionate racial/ethnic identification. In reference to Indicators 9 and 10, if inappropriate identification is occurring, the referral due process seems the most logical timeframe to examine the possibilities. This study can further help identify inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices related to timely evaluations within the EC programs and school districts.

At the direction of the ADE, the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office issued an RFP for the development of the Automated Monitoring Interface (AMI™) Software. This software interacted with the Computer Automation Systems, Inc. program Special Education Automated System, SEAS™, an electronic IEP program used by school districts in the State. The AMI™ software allowed remote electronic compliance monitoring of IEPs.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of the timely evaluation data and the results will be forwarded to the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section (M/PE). The M/PE Section will notify any LEA that fails to conduct timely evaluations. If the failure to meet timelines is due to policies, procedures, or practices the LEA will be required to incorporate corrective actions into its Arkansas School Consolidated Improvement Plan (ACSIP).

The State M/PE Section will incorporate the protocol for identifying inappropriate policies, procedures, and practices into the Monitoring Procedural Handbook.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the migration of the AMI™ software to the ADE servers.

The State M/PE Section will implement the use the AMI™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will analyze the 2005-06 early childhood and school age referral tracking data to identify patterns of noncompliance of timely evaluations and submit a report to M/PE.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of the timely evaluation data and the results will be forwarded to the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section (M/PE). The M/PE Section will notify any LEA that fails to conduct timely evaluations. If the failure to meet timelines for school age children is due to policies, procedures, or practices, LEAs will be required to incorporate corrective actions into their Arkansas School Consolidated Improvement Plan (ACSIP). Early childhood programs will be required to submit a written plan of corrective action to the ADE-SEU.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the implementation of increased business rules in the data collection systems to help ensure data entry accuracy.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will continue to provide training to LEAs on proper submission of required data.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will oversee the final implementation of the AMI™ software.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of the timely evaluation data and the results will be forwarded to the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section (M/PE). The M/PE Section will notify any LEA that fails to conduct timely evaluations. If the failure to meet timelines for school age children is due to policies, procedures, or practices, LEAs will be required to incorporate corrective actions into their Arkansas School Consolidated Improvement Plan (ACSIP). Early childhood programs will be required to submit a written plan of corrective action to the ADE-SEU.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of the timely evaluation data and the results will be forwarded to the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section (M/PE). The M/PE Section will notify any LEA that fails to conduct timely evaluations. If the failure to meet timelines for school age children is due to policies, procedures, or practices, LEAs will be required to incorporate corrective actions into their Arkansas School Consolidated Improvement Plan (ACSIP). Early childhood programs will be required to submit a written plan of corrective action to the ADE-SEU.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The IDEA Data & Research Office will conduct an analysis of the timely evaluation data and the results will be forwarded to the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness Section (M/PE). The M/PE Section will notify any LEA that fails to conduct timely evaluations. If the failure to meet timelines for school age children is due to policies, procedures, or practices, LEAs will be required to incorporate corrective actions into their Arkansas School Consolidated Improvement Plan (ACSIP). Early childhood programs will be required to submit a written plan of corrective action to the ADE-SEU.

The State M/PE Section will continue to review district policies, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

The State M/PE Section will continue to use the *AMI*™ software as a means to conduct desk audits of IEPs in the review of district policy, procedures, and practices that may lead to inappropriate identification.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

The development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan began in May 2005 with the appointment of a 40-member stakeholder group. This group consisted of consumers, parents, school officials, legislators, and other interested parties. Initial orientations to the State Performance Plan (SPP) were provided to the stakeholders group as well as to the State Advisory Panel in June 2005.

In July 2005, a half-day working session was conducted for members of the stakeholder group and the State Advisory Panel. After a brief orientation, members were assigned to one of three task groups focusing on the establishment of measurable, rigorous targets, strategies for improving performance, and steps necessary for obtaining broad-based public input. The recommendations and considerations generated by these task groups laid the foundation for the development of the Arkansas SPP.

After additional work to develop the content of the SPP around the 20 indicators, the SPP was presented to the State Advisory Panel in mid-October 2005 for its comments and modifications. Advisory Panel SPP changes were incorporated and presented to the 40-member stakeholder group in a series of conference calls in late October 2005.

Changes made to the SPP since its original dissemination are presented to the stakeholder group and State Advisory Panel. The feedback provided by these groups will be incorporated into the SPP for subsequent submissions.

Further changes suggested by the stakeholder group were made in November 2005 while additional data and targets were assembled. The SPP was posted on the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education website as a series of program area "mini-volumes" in mid-November 2005. Comments were solicited from the public on the SPP topics of FAPE in the LRE, pre- and post-school outcomes, child find, and special education over-representation.

Following the submission of the Arkansas APR on February 1, 2009, the Arkansas Department of Education - Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) will utilize the ADE-SEU website as the primary vehicle for the annual dissemination of the APR on progress or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets. Additionally, e-version copies of the APR, along with an explanatory cover letter from the Arkansas Commissioner of Education, will be sent to the headquarters of each public library operating within the Arkansas public library system. Further, an official press release will be prepared and provided to all statewide media outlets detailing how the public may obtain or review a copy of the APR. Lastly, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will report annually to the public on each Local Education Agency's (LEA) performance against the SPP targets using the Special Education website as well as in an ongoing series of performance reports disseminated to statewide and local media outlets, primarily the print media.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination
b. Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday
d. Number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services

Account for children included in *a* but not in *b* or *c*. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

Account for children included in *a* but not included in *b, c* or *d*. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP was developed and the reasons for the delay.

Percent = *c* divided by (*a* − *b* − *d*) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Previously, the Part C to Part B transition data were not comparable due to different lead agencies' data collection procedures and reporting periods. Although the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education Unit and the Lead Agency for Part C, Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services (ADHHS) Developmental Disabilities Services (DDS), jointly developed the Program Effectiveness Evaluation Profile (PEEP) system with specific questions concerning transition from Part C to Part B early childhood, alignment problems with the data still existed.

During the 2003-04 reporting period, ADE and DDS worked jointly to unify the 3-5 PEEP data collection and align the Part C PEEP transition questions. Additionally, all 3-5 programs enter their PEEP data through the ADE's website.

To address issues surrounding EI to EC transition, Arkansas applied for and was awarded a joint Part B and Part C GSEG in October 2004. One focus of the grant was transition to preschool. In February 2005, a two-day joint transition training was held focusing on best practices and coordination between the two lead agencies and local service providers. In March 2005, the group was brought back together to develop regional transition coordinating plans. The two meetings assisted service providers in identifying barriers to a seamless transition and how the various barriers could be overcome. Furthermore, from these meetings another group was formed to develop a transition brochure to address the basic information that families need to be aware of as their child grows older.

Arkansas' lead agencies for Part B and Part C work together to insure that all children transitioning from early intervention to early childhood services have eligibility determination and an IEP in place by their third birthday. Part C provides a list of children turning three to Part B programs at least 90 days prior to the third birthday.

The number of children transitioning from EI to EC is submitted to ADE by the Part C lead agency. In addition, each early childhood program reports the number of children served throughout the fiscal year which transitioned from Part C and were found eligible for Part B services through the Program Effectiveness Evaluation Profile (PEEP) system.

Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, the early childhood transition data will also be collected in the APSCN special education referral tracking system. Each referral received by EC programs is entered and if the child is transitioning from Part C, the programs indicate "Y" at the Transition Part C field. Additionally, business rules in the APSCN confirm if eligibility is determined by the third birthday. If eligibility determination exceeds the third birthday a reason must be entered.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

A) Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination: 1,210
B) Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays: 163 or 13.47%
C) Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday: 881 or 72.81%

Overall Percentage = 881/ (1,210-163) = 84.15%

Account for children included in *a* but not in *b* or *c*. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

There are 162 or 13.39% of children with eligibility not determined by the time they exited Part C. The status of these children is unknown; therefore, we will be revising data collections on this indicator to insure the most accurate and reliable data available.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Approximately 10% of all early childhood referrals each year are transitions from Part C early intervention programs. In 2005, 1,210 children with disabilities transitioned from EI to EC of which 881 or 72.81% were found eligible to receive EC services and 13.47% were found to be ineligible by their third birthday. It is unclear if the remaining 13.39% were found eligible or ineligible after their third birthday. Overall, the percent of children who were found eligible and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays was 84.15%
	The coordination between the ADE and the DDS has increased significantly in the area of transition to preschool. This coordination has lead to greater data reliability and validity. In the past two years this coordination has resulted in a 268% improvement in the tracking and reporting of children transitioning to EC from EI. ADE expects continued improvement of agency and program coordination in the area of transition between the two lead agencies.
	However, there are still data concerns, especially around tracking of children and the reasons for delays in eligibility determination. Part B is still having difficulty with aligning data submitted by programs to the Part C data set in regard to the actual number of three year olds referred to Part B and eligibility determination made by the third birthday. ADE has incorporated the information into APSCN, for 2005-06, to gather more precise information

	surrounding the transition of children from Part C to Part B. In addition, the ADE will require DDS 3-5 programs to submit the same data through the special education MySped Resource web site.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	The 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 100%.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	The 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 100%
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	The 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 100%
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	The 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 100%
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	The 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 100%
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	The 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 birthday 100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will work with the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN) to ensure that all children data elements for reporting this indicator are in the special education module by developing a new referral-tracking component including transition from Part C.

The ADE will monitor early childhood programs for effective transition policies, procedures, and practices.

The ADE and the IDEA Data & Research Office will develop a web application for DDS programs to submit referral, transition, and child count data directly to the ADE.

Part B in collaboration with Part C will continue the development of a seamless web-based data collection and tracking system that focuses not only on transition, but also on all aspects of EI and EC services. This seamless birth through five tracking system is a major component of Arkansas' (joint Part C and Part B 619) 2004 General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) application.

Conduct a follow-up training for both Part C and Part B IEP teams on best practices and how to conduct successful Part C to Part B transition conferences. Transition is an integral part of Arkansas' joint (Part C and Part B 619) 2003-04 General Supervision Enhancement Grant application.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will monitor early childhood (EC) programs for effective transition policies, procedures, and practices. The web-based Early Childhood Special Education Coordination system (ECSPEC) will be implemented to facilitate referrals from early childhood-serving agencies to EC programs.

The SEU will develop an EC child tracking/reporting system for programs not part of the ADE data system. The application will be incorporated into MySped Resource.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will provide annual in-service training to EC service providers on the revisions and proper submission of data.

Part B in collaboration with Part C will continue the development of a seamless web-based data collection and tracking system that focuses not only on transition, but also on all aspects of EI and EC services.

Early childhood transition is a key element of the Arkansas GSEG awarded in 2004-05. One of the last activities under the GSEG is the creation of an Early Childhood Transition training DVD available online through **Arkansas IDEAS. Arkansas IDEAS** is **I**nternet **D**elivered **E**ducation for **A**rkansas **S**chools provided by the Arkansas On-line Professional Development Initiative through a committed partnership of the Arkansas Educational Television Network and the Arkansas Department of Education

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will review early childhood program data for compliance with transition requirements.

The Special Education Data Manager will provide annual training to EC service providers on the revisions and proper submission of data.

The ADE along with DHS will conduct joint Part C and Part B 619 training on transition to ensure a seamless transition for children and families, including the use of the ECSPEC system.

In accordance with the monitoring cycle, the M/PE staff will review child Outcomes and Assessments. Program staff will be expected to review their data to identify professional development needs relative to improving child outcomes.

The Arkansas 619 Coordinator and a local EC Coordinator will present at the Arkansas Special Education Early Childhood Professionals Fall Conference. The presentation will cover preschool regulations and the process for determining EC outcomes. Over 200 participants are expected to be in attendance.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will review early childhood program data for compliance with transition requirements.

The Special Education Data Manager will provide annual training to EC service providers on the revisions and proper submission of data.

The ADE along with DHS will conduct joint Part C and Part B 619 training on transition to ensure a seamless transition for children and families, including the use of the ECSPEC system.

The 619 Coordinator will conduct quarterly meetings with the Part C lead agency, DDS.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will review early childhood program data for compliance with transition requirements.

The Special Education Data Manager will provide annual training to EC service providers on the revisions and proper submission of data.

The ADE along with DHS will conduct joint Part C and Part B 619 training on transition to ensure a seamless transition for children and families, including the use of the ECSPEC system.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will review early childhood program data for compliance with transition requirements.

The Special Education Data Manager will provide annual training to EC service providers on the revisions and proper submission of data.

The ADE along with DHS will conduct joint Part C and Part B 619 training on transition to ensure a seamless transition for children and families, including the use of the ECSPEC system.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

Percent = number of youth with disabilities 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 divided by the number of youth with an IEP aged 16 and above times 100.

The data is collected through the Program Evaluation and Effectiveness Profile (PEEP) which collects information from each LEA for all IEPs implemented throughout the school year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
The State recognizes the interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. This interrelationship has been documented in prior State Annual Performance Reports (APRs) highlighting the ongoing emphasis on the general supervision continuous improvement monitoring system which focuses on specific school districts showing poor performance on graduation and dropout rate indicators and secondary grade benchmark assessment results.

Beginning no later than the first IEP to be in effect when an Arkansas youth with an IEP is 16, appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills and the transition services (including courses of study) needed to assist the child in reaching these goals are developed.

Arkansas has demonstrated in prior APRs the ongoing development of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early Transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve youth with an IEP post-school outcomes. The State partners in secondary and postsecondary education established the Arkansas planning priorities surrounding the critical activities.

The Monitoring/Program Effectiveness Section of the Special Education Unit reviews district IEPs to ascertain a district's status with regard to secondary transition plans. If an IEP is found to be noncompliant, the district is issued a "CAP" and must submit a corrective action plan to the ADE.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)
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: 98.42%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable

| FFY 2005 (2005-2006) | 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: 98.42%

School districts report their secondary transition data via Program Evaluation Effectiveness Profile (PEEP) via MySped Resource. During the 2005-06 data collection, the entire ADE network was taken off line for more than two-months causing the data collection to be modified. Instead of LEAs entering data directly into PEEP, they had to fill out the required form in a Microsoft Word file and submit the information via e-mail to the IDEA Data & Research Office at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. The Data & Research Office worked with districts to clarify any questionable submissions and the SEU database administrator to upload the data once the network became available.

The State is mindful of the close interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. Arkansas has a history of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early Transition strategic planning in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve youth with an IEP post-school outcomes.

These activities were identified in 2005-06 through the use of the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition (NASET) Self-Assessment Tool. State partners in secondary and postsecondary education established the Arkansas planning priorities prior to the National Center for Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) National Leadership Summit using this tool. Of the five NASET quality indicators, three (schooling, career preparation, and connecting activities) were chosen by the Arkansas team as priorities for comprehensive planning. Within each of these three priorities, goals and action steps were developed to guide strategies during 2005-06.

The State is using staff and resources of the National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth for additional technical assistance related to identifying needed planning partners centering on transportation, housing, and technology. The State is also using staff funded through Title VI-B set-aside dollars to offer student-specific interventions. These staff members are accessed through the Special Education website request for services process known as "CIRCUIT" (http://arksped.k12.ar.us/sections/circuit.html).

The regional cadre of special education consultants is available to assist in interventions for students with sensory disabilities, multiple physical disabilities, behavior, and autism spectrum disorders. Services can be requested by parents, guardians, caregivers, school personnel, or any other concerned party. It is anticipated that CIRCUIT will provide school personnel and parents with an easy access process to obtain support for students with disabilities at risk of dropping out. CIRCUIT received 816 requests for assistance during the 2005-06 school year. Fifty-six of the requests were referred to the Post-school Outcome Interventions for Special Education (P.O.I.S.E.) consultants.

The State is using technology, as well, to offer technical assistance resources to students, school personnel, and parents through the new website HighSchoolMatters.com (http://www.highschoolmatters.com). This web resource offers Arkansas-specific information on college, employment, community resources, and self-determination. |

	HighSchoolMatters.com will become a rich resource for offering practical guidance on strategies for staying in school and making the most of the secondary educational experience.
	
	Additional activities surrounding secondary transition included:
	• Local Transition Team Development;
	• Transition Information Night for Parents;
	• Arkansas Interagency Transition Partnership;
	• Self Determination in Arkansas Research Project with the Beach Center on Disability;
	• Statewide Transition Summit;
	• Work with schools that hired School-based Transition Coordinators; and
	• Numerous training events
	    o Person Centered Planning Statewide Training,
	    o Making the Connections Training,
	    o Transition Training, and
	    o Life After High School Training.
	
	In 2004-05, Arkansas undertook a pilot survey study of general and special education graduates in 20 high schools. LifeTrack, Inc., in Spring 2006 conducted the one-year follow-up survey with a return rate of 83.3%. Question 5 of the survey asked if their school provided sufficient understanding so their transition to post high school was smooth. Seventy-eight percent of respondents indicated yes, 8% indicated no and 13.9% gave no response.
	
	The individual analysis of special education and general education was not available at the time of submitting this report.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	100% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post secondary goals.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	100% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post secondary goals.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	100% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post secondary goals.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	100% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post secondary goals.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100% of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post secondary goals.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)　　The State is mindful of the close interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. This interrelationship has been documented in prior State Annual Performance Reports

(APRs) highlighting the ongoing emphasis on the general supervision continuous improvement monitoring system, which focuses on specific school districts showing poor performance on graduation and dropout rate indicators and secondary grade benchmark assessment results. Prior APRs have also documented the ongoing development of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early Transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve youth with IEP post-school outcomes.

These activities are considered critical in meeting the improvement targets set in the SPP. These and other critical elements were identified in 2005-06 through the use of the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition (NASET) Self-Assessment Tool. State partners in secondary and postsecondary education established the Arkansas planning priorities prior to the National Center for Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) National Leadership Summit using this tool.

Of the five NASET quality indicators, three (schooling, career preparation, and connecting activities) were chosen by the Arkansas team as priorities for comprehensive planning. Within each of these three priorities, goals and action steps were developed to guide strategies during 2005-06. The three priorities identified are:

SCHOOLING: In order to perform at optimal levels in all educational settings, all youth need to participate in educational programs grounded in standards, clear performance expectations, and graduation exit options based upon meaningful, accurate, and relevant indicators of student learning and skills. Often this occurs without the input from agencies outside of education. Arkansas needs to include other agencies in its school planning to ensure the educational process provides; career and technical programs that are based on professional and industry standards; common performance measures; and individualized transition plans that lead to positive post-school outcomes.

CAREER PREPARATORY EXPERIENCES: Arkansas needs to bring together multi-agency programs to better serve youth with an IEP in the following areas: finding, formally requesting and securing appropriate supports and reasonable accommodations in education, training and employment settings; career assessments to help identify students' school and post-school preferences and interests; structured exposure to post-secondary educational and other life-long learning opportunities; exposure to career opportunity requirements including information about entry requirements, educational requirements, income and benefits potential and asset accumulation; and, improved job-seeking skills and basic work-place skills.

CONNECTING ACTIVITIES: Improve interagency collaboration through: exploration of additional ways to collaborate (e.g., joint training, data sharing, interagency transition conferences, and funding coordination); development of a comprehensive plan for communication and the dissemination of transition information for youth with an IEP; and expansion of training and technical assistance.

The State is using staff and resources of the National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth for additional technical assistance related to identifying needed planning partners centering on transportation, housing, and technology. The State is also using staff funded through Title VI-B set-aside dollars to offer student-specific interventions. These staff members are accessed through the Special Education website request for services process known as "CIRCUIT" (http://arksped.k12.ar.us/sections/circuit.html).

As explained on the CIRCUIT web page, the IDEA authorizes State activities to Local Education Agencies, including direct and supportive service activities, to improve results for children with disabilities, ages 3 to 21, by ensuring a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. For this purpose, a

regional cadre of special education consultants is available who can assist in interventions for students with sensory disabilities, multiple physical disabilities, behavior, and autism spectrum disorders. Services can be requested by parents, guardians, caregivers, school personnel, or any other concerned party. It is anticipated that CIRCUIT will provide school personnel and parents with an easy access process to obtain support for youth with IEPs at risk of dropping out.

The State is using technology, as well, to offer technical assistance resources to students, school personnel, and parents through the new website HighSchoolMatters.com (http://www.highschoolmatters.com). This web resource offers Arkansas-specific information on college, employment, community resources, and self-determination. HighSchoolMatters.com will become a rich resource for offering practical guidance on strategies for staying in school and making the most of the secondary educational experience.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   In addition to developing school-centered strategies begun in 2005-06, the State intends to apply through the National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices for the Academy on Improving Outcomes for Young Adults with Disabilities. Through the Academy, substantial gaps and overlaps in agency programs, particularly in relation to service needs, services provided, and cross-agency performance standards will be addressed.

It is clear that youth with IEPs are underutilizing core services available in the state and that graduation and dropout indicators will improve if this can be effectively addressed. At the State-level, Arkansas needs to identify and braid individual funding streams targeted to serving these youth. There is no blueprint to guide local areas that are ready, willing, and able to begin co-locating and integrating services.

One of the products of this activity will be the development of a State Resource Map for identified agencies serving Arkansas youth between the ages of 14 and 30. For a student to graduate and to have a good experience in the world of work, the amount and type of preparation that leads to employment can make the difference between success and failure. The changing nature of the job market makes employment more difficult to obtain without specific skills. There are many resources available to students, teachers, counselors and transition coordinators to aid in the postsecondary and career planning process. The problem is that the resources lack integration and are often not user-friendly. Through the Academy, Arkansas hopes to create a comprehensive, integrated and self-directed tool for the student that interfaces aptitudes as determined from test scores and grades, interests, and skills with current Labor Market Information and Occupational Trends. By matching individual skills and aptitudes with career educational and skill requirements, youth with IEPs will identify realistic career goals, including entry into postsecondary educational settings.

The CIRCUIT service request process will be expanded to offer earlier interventions for students at risk of dropping out. The expansion will include the use of the P.O.I.S.E. team as an intervention for students prior to age 14. HighSchoolMatters.com will expand to offer greater interactivity between state-level and local education and employment personnel.

In an effort to improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities in Arkansas, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE), Special Education Unit, provides funding to support the employment of a cadre of Special Education Transition Specialists to serve local education agencies throughout the State. These individuals are working to develop local transition teams for children with disabilities. Around the nation, there is continued emphasis on the importance of interagency collaboration to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs. Research shows that the better the collaboration at the local and state levels, the better the outcomes for youth with IEPs.

The key to effective collaboration is building and maintaining relationships. On the local level, schools need

to build relationships with public and private agencies, local service providers, business and industry, and other community members. The development and use of local transition teams by school districts is a major building block in establishing the relationships. Local transition teams can improve post-school outcomes for students by providing the following:

- More opportunities for work experience within the community;
- More effective transition from school to adult life (fewer students fall through the cracks);
- More services for students; and
- Less duplication of services, therefore, monies can be spent more efficiently and a wider array of services can be provided.

On February 21-22, 2007, the "2007 Arkansas Transition Summit: Real Options for Positive Outcomes" will be held at the Embassy Suites, Little Rock, Arkansas.

The goals are:
- to build or enhance local level, cross-disciplinary Transition Teams for improving post school results for youth with IEPs;
- to develop goals and action steps for local Transition Teams; and
- to identify technical assistance needs of Transition Teams.

The Arkansas Transition Summit will assist school districts in building or enhancing local transition teams. School districts or community members must assemble a team of people within the community or county to participate in the Arkansas Transition Summit. This team will serve as the local transition team for the community or county. The team registration form for the Arkansas Transition Summit, as well as, information regarding the required team composition, is contained in the attachments. Time is allotted during the Transition Summit for teams to engage in team planning. Teams will leave the Transition Summit with a plan to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs within the local community or county.

The Secondary Transition Team will provide training on effective transition planning, person centered planning, how to write a meaningful transition plan, assistive technology, and technical assistance opportunities; continue the Self-Determination in Arkansas project (SDAR); host the Transition Summit, local transition team meetings, and the Transition Institute; and participate in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum and College Bound Arkansas.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities strategies developed in 2005-06 and refined in 2006-07. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide. CIRCUIT, HighSchoolMatters.com and the P.O.I.S.E. team will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving outcomes related to the secondary transition indicator..

Today nearly all students are expected to graduate from high school. Yet, hundreds of thousands in the United States leave school early each year without a diploma (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Researchers have identified ninth grade as the most critical point to intervene and prevent students from losing motivation, failing and dropping out of school. According to the 2005-06 dropout data from the State's Student Information System (SIS), 1,018 ninth graders did not re-enroll for the 2006-07 school year.

The Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project will identify a longitudinal cohort of ninth graders beginning with the 2007-2008 school year and will be available to all public school districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and state-operated educational programs. Ninth grade student

performance data will be added to the SIS Cycle 3 November 15, 2007 data submission for the identification of students failing one or more classes during the initial grading period. Districts, working with the P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams, will administer universal interventions (Response to Intervention) for a period of time not to exceed 10 weeks. A second student performance data collection will be conducted in SIS Cycle 5 February 15, 2008 to identify students having failed the semester. Once students have been identified as failing the semester, districts will administer targeted interventions (Intervention Prevention) with additional individualized student-centered supports not to exceed 20 weeks. All interventions will be tracked to determine effectiveness related to student performance. P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will coordinate interventions based upon disaggregated data. The IDEA Data & Research Office will develop an evaluation methodology for the C.O.R.E. project.

Additional activities aimed at improving secondary transition will be conducted throughout the year by the P.O.I.S.E. staff.

The Secondary Transition Team Training and Events include:
- Training on how to use the Indicator 13 checklist provided by the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) in districts throughout Arkansas. Data obtained will be used to improve transition services. This is included in a comprehensive assessment training provided to teachers. Teachers are given the complete toolkit from NSTTAC on the Indicator 13 checklist.
- Continued partnership with the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center to improve transition services and ultimately improve student post school outcomes. NSTTAC is also working with the State secondary transition team in a "Focus" school, West Memphis High School. In particular, the team is working closely with the LEA Supervisor, the Transition Coordinator for West Memphis High School and a Special Education teacher in implementing a Transitions Class. NSTTAC along with the team from the Arkansas Transition Services is providing financial and technical assistance. Data will be collected and reported to determine what tools, assessments, curricula and practices were most effective.
- Participation in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum. This event is put on by Arkansas Rehabilitation Services and information for one of the sessions is presented by a transition consultant. This forum is designed to assist high school students with disabilities to learn leadership and self-determination skills. In the transition session students are provided the opportunity to learn the importance of disability awareness, goal setting, and self-advocacy skills they will need for post-secondary education and the work place.
- The website www.highschoolmatters.com went online in 2006 and in 2008 the website was redesigned and received a new name, Arkansas Transition Services, located at http://arkansastransition.com. Each transition consultant has a focus area and one consultant serves as the webmaster. The website is continually updated.
- Person-Centered Planning Training and facilitation of meetings.
- Training for districts on "How to Develop a Transitions Class." Over 75 new Transitions Classes have begun in the state since 2007, with approximately 185 teachers and supervisors receiving the training to date. Each attendee receives a manual that serves as a guide in developing a Transitions Class.
- Transitions II Class Training is being developed. This training assists teachers in designing unique programs to enhance student growth and outcomes. Teachers are provided a workbook and receive in depth training and tools on how to successfully recruit employers in their areas. The training focuses on incorporating a community based program into a student's transition plan when that need is indicated.

- Self-Advocacy Strategy Training: The Self Advocacy Strategy is a motivation and self-determination strategy designed to prepare students for participation in education or transition planning conferences. The strategy consists of five steps which are taught over a series of seven acquisition and generalization stages. The five steps are presented using the mnemonic "I PLAN" to help cue students to remember the steps for the strategy. Five districts are known to have purchased the curriculum. The strategies are linked to the Indicator 13 Checklist as follows:
  - o Item #1: Student participation in identification of postsecondary goals
  - o Item #5: Student involvement in identification of strengths, needs, and preferences within the transition assessment process
- TAKE OFF! (Transition Activities Keeping Effective Options First and Foremost). This training is offered to teachers on how to create and execute an exit portfolio for students with disabilities in their senior year. TAKE OFF! is a set of activities designed to help teachers compile information to create a successful graduation packet. The portfolio training focuses on
  - o how students can assist in writing their Summary of Performance (SOP)
  - o storing all agency contacts and correspondence in a portfolio
  - o maintaining student testing data relative to qualifying assessments for enrollment in post secondary schools
  - o activities to engage parents in the transition process

  Districts have the opportunity to purchase student, parent and teacher manuals for TAKE OFF! implementation.
- Arkansas Transition Summit, February 6-7, 2008. The third annual transition summit will provide existing teams and new teams an opportunity to come together to focus on student focused planning and interagency collaboration, in an effort to improve post school outcomes for youth with IEPs. National speakers with expertise in these areas will present general sessions and breakout sessions. Arkansas teachers and agency personnel will also present successful programs in an effort to get other teachers to replicate them in their schools. Each team will have four separate planning sessions in which to assess their needs, set goals and develop an action plan to achieve those goals. Local team meetings will continue to be encouraged so teams continue making progress on their plans. It is anticipated that over 200 participants will be in attendance
- The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.
- College Bound 2008 will be held June 18-20, 2008 at UCA in Conway, AR.
- Implementing a plan to work with the Division on Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) to produce a program to be shown on AETN in the spring of 2009 which will explain more of the transition process including SSI, SSDI, applying for PASS plans, etc. This program will use easy to understand language with a focus on parents and students in an effort to increase their knowledge and understanding of what is available to them.
- Participation from various consultants on CASSP teams around the state.
- Plan and conduct Transition orientation nights for parents for each education cooperative area.
- Plan and conduct Transition fairs for students and families to learn about area agencies and services they provide.
- Sponsor Transition youth conferences throughout the State. Two youth conferences will be held in 2008, one in Southwest Arkansas and another in Southeast Arkansas in February targeting junior and senior high students with disabilities.
- Submit proposals for presentations on Transition activities at the state and national level.

- Attendance at the Secondary Transition State Planning Institute. Members of Arkansas Transition Services will attend this annual meeting in May 2008 to continue work on a state plan to improve indicator outcomes. The group will convene again in May 2009.
- Newsletters. Each Transition Consultant provides a monthly newsletter to teachers, supervisors and others in his service area with a focus on transition related issues and highlights of successful programs.
- College Camp at University of Arkansas at Little Rock. In collaboration with PEPNet, Arkansas Transition Services will provide assistance in recruiting attendees for a four day college camp for students with hearing impairments. The camp will provide a real-life picture of life on a college campus. Students will attend workshops and stay in dormitories. Arkansas Transition Services will provide an interactive workshop on self-determination. Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009) State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities strategies developed in 2005-06 and refined in the subsequent years. Additional local school district and postsecondary partners will be added as these initiatives continue to be deployed and implemented statewide. CIRCUIT and http://arkansastransition.com. will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving the outcomes related to the secondary transition indicator. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010) State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be implemented statewide. CIRCUIT and http://arkansastransition.com will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving the outcomes related to the secondary transition indicator. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all of the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.

Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   State partners in secondary and postsecondary education will continue to implement the NASET Self-Assessment Tool planning priorities. Other strategies centering on state-level integration will be refined and maintained. The Partners in Transition effort will be operational statewide. CIRCUIT and http://arkansastransition.com. will continue to be utilized as vehicles for improving the outcomes related to the secondary transition indicator. The P.O.I.S.E. Technical Advisory Teams will continue to implement the Changing Outcomes through Retention Elements (C.O.R.E.) project. The Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) will continue to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

Percent = number 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 divided by the number of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Arkansas recognizes the interrelationship of State Performance Plan Indicators centering on graduation rates, dropout rates, coordinated and measurable IEP goals, and post-school success. This interrelationship has been documented in prior State Annual Performance Reports (APRs) highlighting the ongoing emphasis on the general supervision continuous improvement monitoring system which focuses on specific school districts showing poor performance on graduation and dropout rate indicators and secondary grade benchmark assessment results.

Beginning no later than the first IEP to be in effect when an Arkansas student with disabilities is 16, appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills and the transition services (including courses of study) needed to assist the child in reaching these goals are developed.

Arkansas has demonstrated in prior APRs the ongoing development of technical assistance and direct service models designed to demonstrate to school districts the importance of effective early Transition strategic planning (prior to age 16) in the areas of training, education, employment, and independent living designed to increase educational benefit and improve disabled student post-school outcomes. The State partners in secondary and postsecondary education while establishing the Arkansas planning priorities identified these critical activities.

With regard to the movement of students from school to post-school activities, Arkansas has aligned its definition of competitive employment with the Rehabilitation Act, as amended, to include integrated work settings in which individuals are working toward competitive work. Additionally, postsecondary education includes two- and four-year colleges, and continuing and adult education, including technical programs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)
Not applicable

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Arkansas has a six-year district sampling plan and is not sampling students. All special education students age 14-21 that leave special education for reasons of graduation, dropout, or reaching maximum age will be surveyed one-year after leaving, based on the sampling plan

	year in which the district was identified.
	Arkansas has established the last Friday in May as the day to pull student contact information each year for grades 9-12. A Commissioner's Memo is released each spring reminding districts of the special data pull.
	The contact information is cross-referenced with the special education module to determine if a student received special education during the school year. The final contact list for youth with IEPs is then cross referenced with special education exits. A final list of youth to be surveyed for districts in the sampling year is compiled in the following February.
	Arkansas has continued to have school district consolidations, which have necessitated changes to the sampling timeline. Districts that were consolidated will be surveyed in the time frame of the receiving district.
	The Special Education Performance Grant at Dawson Education Cooperative will contract with LifeTrack Services, Inc. to conduct the data collection between April 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007. The IDEA Data & Research Office will coordinate the collection with LifeTrack and conduct all analysis.
	In 2004-05, Arkansas undertook a pilot survey study of general and special education graduates in 20 high schools. LifeTrack, Inc., in Spring 2006 conducted the one-year follow-up survey with a return rate of 83.3%. The composite data reveals that one-year after graduating high school: 29.5% are working full time; 30.2% are working part time; 3.8% are in the military; 39.4% are attending a 4-year college/university; 18.6% are attending a 2-year college; and 1.4% are participating in vocational/technical programs. The individual analysis of special education and general education was not available at the time of submitting this report.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Post School Outcome Survey Results There were 47 districts sampled based on the stratified random sampling plan. From those 47 districts, Arkansas had 320 students that responded to the PSO survey request. Of the respondents, 270 youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or both, within one year of leaving high school. This yielded an employment/postsecondary school rate of 84.38%. The survey revealed that 75.63% of leavers have been employed at some point in the year since exiting high school. However, only 39.38% have been enrolled in post secondary education. Only 15.63% have not been employed or enrolled in post secondary education in the year since leaving high school. Presented in Exhibit I-14.1 is a summary of survey results.

Exhibit I-14.1: Summary of Post School Outcome Survey Results by Percentage

	Employment		Education		Combination of Education/ Employment				Overall
	Y	N	Y	N	Both	Neither	Employed not Enrolled	Enrolled not Employed	Employed, Enrolled, or both
# of Respondents	242	78	126	194	98	50	144	28	270
% of Total	75.63%	24.38%	39.38%	60.63%	30.63%	15.63%	45.00%	8.75%	84.38%

n = 320

Discussion of Survey Process and Representativeness

Student contact information, including demographics, were gathered from the State's Student Information System on the last Friday in May as outlined in Commissioner's Memo LS-07-119 (http://arkedu.state.ar.us/commemos/static/fy0607/3367.html). Once leaver data were cleaned and submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs as required under Section 618, contact information on students reported as graduates, drop outs, or reaching maximum age was compiled for the districts being sampled in the given year.

Arkansas adopted the post school outcome questions from the National Post School Outcomes Center. A copy of the survey is located in Appendix I. Demographic data, although on the survey form, were not collected as part of the survey. Student responses were cross-referenced with the contact information gathered via the SIS using student identifier.

LifeTrack Services, Inc. was contracted through the Special Education Performance Grant at Dawson Education Cooperative to conduct the PSO data collection between April 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007. The IDEA Data & Research Office coordinated the collection with LifeTrack and conducts all analysis. The scope of work outlined in the contract with LifeTrack Services included:

- The Dawson Education Cooperative in collaboration with the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office at University of Arkansas at Little Rock and the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education Unit will provide LifeTrack Services, Inc. with a list of questions to be included in the survey and a list of 2006 leavers with name, address, telephone number, school code and student ID to be included in the survey.
- Between April 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007 LifeTrack Services will attempt 5 telephone calls to leavers identified by ADE.
- LifeTrack shall compile the responses and provide compilation reports to the Department by September 30, 2007.
- LifeTrack will provide the IDEA Data & Research Office with a complete data set, as well as survey reports for each district. An additional summary report will be provided for all students surveyed for that year.
- LifeTrack shall maintain the confidentiality of any and all information provided by representatives of the ADE Special Education Unit. No information will be released to any other entity without the written consent of the Department.

The 2005-06 special education leaver data identified 862 students as graduates, dropouts, or reaching maximum age. The contact information for these students was forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. in March 2007.

LifeTrack began contacting former students in April and continued the phone survey through June 2007. Although steps were taken to verify contact information, 42.8% (369) of telephone

numbers were either disconnected or had changed resulting in wrong numbers. Contact information was valid for 493 or 57.2% of leavers. LifeTrack Services exceeded their commitment of 5 telephone attempts by making a 6th attempt to all remaining telephone numbers that were not disconnected or wrong numbers. Exhibit I-14.2 provides an overview of the outcome of student contact information.

Exhibit I-14.2: Outcome of Student Contact Information

Number of Leavers	Invalid Contact Information	Valid Contact Information	Completed Survey's	Responders Rate Based on Valid Contact Information
862	369	493	320	64.9%

An analysis of representativeness was conducted on number of leavers and responders based on racial/ethnic and disability composition. The analysis revealed that responders were relatively similar to the composition of leavers over all for racial/ethnic groups and disability categories. These findings are presented in Exhibit I-14.3 and Exhibit I-14.4.

Exhibit I-14.3: Racial/Ethnic Representativeness of Survey Responders by Percentage

	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black (non-Hispanic)	Hispanic	White (non-Hispanic)
Leavers	0.34%	0.81%	23.90%	4.06%	70.77%
Responders	0.32%	0.95%	23.49%	3.81%	71.43%
Difference	0.02%	-0.14%	0.41%	0.25%	-0.66%

Exhibit I-14.4: Disability Representativeness of Survey Responders by Percentages

	Autism	Emotional Disturbance	Hearing Impaired	Multiple Disabilities	Mental Retardation
Leavers	1.86%	1.97%	3.71%	2.44%	20.77%
Responders	2.22%	1.90%	3.49%	3.17%	18.73%
Difference	-0.37%	0.07%	0.22%	-0.74%	2.04%

	Other Health Impairment	Orthopedic Impairment	Specific Learning Disability	Speech/ Language Impairment	Traumatic Brain Injury
Leavers	15.66%	0.23%	51.74%	1.39%	0.23%
Responders	18.09%	0.63%	49.21%	2.22%	0.32%
Difference	-2.43%	-0.40%	2.53%	-0.83%	-0.09%

However, the same analysis conducted at the district level found the response rate in some programs was not representative. Additional activities will be incorporated into the data preparation to ensure contact information is as up to date as possible. Activities will include (1) giving districts an additional opportunity to verify contact information and (2) the IDEA Data & Research Office will provide districts with a draft letter they can use to notify former students of the upcoming survey. These will provide opportunities to update contact information prior to sending the final student list to LifeTrack Services, Inc. thus increasing the possibility of having valid contact information.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	84.4% of youth who had IEPs (leaving school in 2006-07), are no longer in secondary school and will be competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	84.5% of youth who had IEPs (leaving school in 2007-08), are no longer in secondary school and will be competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	84.6% of youth who had IEPs (leaving school in 2008-09), are no longer in secondary school and will be competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	84.8% of youth who had IEPs (leaving school in 2009-10), are no longer in secondary school and will be competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school
FFY 2011 (2011-2012)	85.0% of youth who had IEPs (leaving school in 2010-11), are no longer in secondary school and will be competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   Arkansas will develop a post school outcome survey to be conducted in the spring of 2007 for graduates, dropouts, and students who exited at maximum age in school year 2005-06. A list of youth with IEPs from each district will be compiled from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The Arkansas Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center will contract with LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups, and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

Arkansas' Post School Outcomes Sampling Plan

Post school outcomes will be collected through a stratified random sample. Stratified random sampling without replacement is used to assign each LEA to a sampling year. The district average daily membership (ADM) strata are based upon 2004-05 data. The strata are assigned according to natural splits in the existing ADM data. Within these strata, LEAs were randomly assigned to a collection year. Little Rock School District, the largest school district in Arkansas with an ADM over 20,000, is the only school district within ADM strata 1; therefore, it is sampled in year one (1) and will be sampled a second time in year six (6). Summaries of the number of districts within each stratum as well as per year are provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Treatment of Missing Data: The survey response rate will be examined and reported. In addition, missing data will be evaluated. Subsequently, a sensitivity analysis will be conducted to investigate the effects, if any, of non-response and missing data on results of the survey. Demographic and historical data will be evaluated with regard to differences between students who respond and those who do not. Estimates and analysis will be adjusted accordingly.

Table 1. ADM Strata

ADM	# Districts	ADM Strata
20,000 and over	1	6
10,000 to 19,999	4	5
5,000 to 9,999	10	4
2,500 to 4,999	29	3
1,000 to 2,499	76	2
1 to 999	144	1
Total	**264**	

Table 2. Randomization Summary Counts per Year and ADM Strata

Sampling Year	ADM Strata by Count of LEA						Grand Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	25	13	6	2	1	1	48
2	26	14	5	2	1		48
3	23	12	5	2	1		43
4	22	13	4	2	1		42
5	22	12	5	1			40
6	26	12	4	1		1	43
Grand Total	**144**	**76**	**29**	**10**	**4**	**2**	**264**

Arkansas in recent years has gone through a series of school district consolidations. More consolidations are anticipated in the future; therefore, the ADM strata and random assignment will be adjusted accordingly for consolidation.

In addition, the number of Charter schools in the State has increased; however, many of the Charter schools do not include high schools. The Charter schools are included in the sampling methodology to ensure their changing enrollment is captured.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2005-06 will be surveyed in spring 2007 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 1 (2005-06) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
1305	CLEVELAND COUNTY	1	1
1503	NEMO VISTA	1	1
1702	CEDARVILLE	1	1
1805	TURRELL	1	1
2305	MAYFLOWER	1	1
2402	CHARLESTON	1	1
2501	MAMMOTH SPRING	1	1
3104	MINERAL SPRINGS	1	1
3701	BRADLEY	1	1
3704	LAFAYETTE COUNTY	1	1
3804	HOXIE	1	1
4204	SCRANTON	1	1
5008	NEVADA COUNTY	1	1
5604	MARKED TREE	1	1
5705	WICKES	1	1
5803	HECTOR	1	1
5903	HAZEN (incl. Devalls Bluff-cons in 06-07)	1	1
6092	ARKANSAS SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF	1	1
6604	HARTFORD	1	1
6605	LAVACA	1	1
7303	BRADFORD	1	1
0504	OMAHA	1	1
0601	HERMITAGE	1	1
0602	WARREN	1	2
1002	ARKADELPHIA	1	2
1602	WESTSIDE	1	2
1612	VALLEY VIEW	1	2
3502	DOLLARWAY (incl. Altheimer-cons.in 06-07)	1	2
4201	BOONEVILLE	1	2
4203	PARIS	1	2
5502	CENTERPOINT	1	2
5703	MENA	1	2
5802	DOVER	1	2
5804	POTTSVILLE	1	2
6802	CAVE CITY	1	2
7208	WEST FORK	1	2
1905	WYNNE	1	3
2606	LAKESIDE	1	3
2705	SHERIDAN	1	3
2808	PARAGOULD	1	3
7001	EL DORADO	1	3
7311	SEARCY	1	3
0401	BENTONVILLE	1	4
4304	CABOT	1	4
7207	SPRINGDALE	1	5
6001	LITTLE ROCK	1	6

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   ADE will compile a list of youth with IEPs from each district from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The information will be forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups, and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

The Secondary Transition Team will provide training on effective transition planning, person centered planning, how to write meaningful transition plans, assistive technology, and technical assistance opportunities; continue the Self-Determination in Arkansas project (SDAR); host the Transition Summit, local transition team meetings, and the Transition Institute; and participate in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum and College Bound Arkansas.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2006-07 will be surveyed in spring 2008 is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 2 (2006-07) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
0402	DECATUR	2	1
0501	ALPENA	2	1
0903	LAKESIDE	2	1
1201	CONCORD	2	1
1605	BUFFALO ISLAND CENTRAL	2	1
1613	RIVERSIDE	2	1
2403	COUNTY LINE	2	1
3203	CUSHMAN	2	1
3211	MIDLAND	2	1
3301	CALICO ROCK	2	1
3405	JACKSON COUNTY	2	1
3806	SLOAN-HENDRIX	2	1
3840	IMBODEN	2	1
4501	FLIPPIN	2	1
4602	GENOA CENTRAL	2	1
4701	ARMOREL	2	1
4902	MOUNT IDA	2	1
5102	JASPER	2	1
5501	DELIGHT	2	1
6091	ARKANSAS SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND	2	1
7309	PANGBURN	2	1
7310	ROSE BUD	2	1
0803	GREEN FOREST	2	2
1101	CORNING	2	2
1603	BROOKLAND	2	2
2002	FORDYCE	2	2
2104	DUMAS	2	2
2202	DREW CENTRAL	2	2
2203	MONTICELLO	2	2
3403	NEWPORT	2	2
4301	LONOKE	2	2
4603	FOUKE	2	2
4708	GOSNELL	2	2
6103	POCAHONTAS	2	2
6804	HIGHLAND	2	2
7204	GREENLAND	2	2
0303	MOUNTAIN HOME	2	3
2603	HOT SPRINGS	2	3
2807	GREENE COUNTY TECH	2	3
3510	WHITE HALL	2	3
5204	FAIRVIEW	2	3
1803	WEST MEMPHIS	2	4
2301	CONWAY	2	4
6601	FORT SMITH	2	5

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   ADE will compile a list of youth with IEPs from each district from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The information will be forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services, along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

Additional activities aimed at improving post school outcomes will be conducted throughout the year by the P.O.I.S.E. staff.

The Secondary Transition Team Training and Events include:
- Training on how to use the Indicator 13 checklist provided by the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) in districts throughout Arkansas. Data obtained will be used to improve transition services. This is included in a comprehensive assessment training provided to teachers. Teachers are given the complete toolkit from NSTTAC on the Indicator 13 checklist.
- Continued partnership with the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center to improve transition services and ultimately improve student post school outcomes. NSTTAC is also working with the State secondary transition team in a "Focus" school, West Memphis High School. In particular, the team is working closely with the LEA Supervisor, the Transition Coordinator for West Memphis High School and a Special Education teacher in implementing a Transitions Class. NSTTAC along with the team from the Arkansas Transition Services is providing financial and technical assistance. Data will be collected and reported to determine what tools, assessments, curricula and practices were most effective.
- Participation in the Arkansas Youth Leadership Forum. This event is put on by Arkansas Rehabilitation Services and information for one of the sessions is presented by a transition consultant. This forum is designed to assist high school students with disabilities to learn leadership and self-determination skills. In the transition session students are provided the opportunity to learn the importance of disability awareness, goal setting, and self-advocacy skills they will need for post-secondary education and the work place.
- The website www.highschoolmatters.com went online in 2006 and in 2008 the website was redesigned and received a new name, Arkansas Transition Services, located at http://arkansastransition.com. Each transition consultant has a focus area and one consultant serves as the webmaster. The website is continually updated.
- Person-Centered Planning Training and facilitation of meetings.
- Training for districts on "How to Develop a Transitions Class." Over 75 new Transitions Classes have begun in the state since 2007, with approximately 185 teachers and supervisors receiving the training to date. Each attendee receives a manual that serves as a guide in developing a Transitions Class.
- Transitions II Class Training is being developed. This training assists teachers in designing unique programs to enhance student growth and outcomes. Teachers are provided a workbook and receive in depth training and tools on how to successfully recruit employers in their areas. The training focuses on incorporating a community based program into a student's transition plan when that need is indicated.

- Self-Advocacy Strategy Training: The Self Advocacy Strategy is a motivation and self-determination strategy designed to prepare students for participation in education or transition planning conferences. The strategy consists of five steps which are taught over a series of seven acquisition and generalization stages. The five steps are presented using the mnemonic "I PLAN" to help cue students to remember the steps for the strategy. Five districts are known to have purchased the curriculum. The strategies are linked to the Indicator 13 Checklist as follows:
    - Item #1: Student participation in identification of postsecondary goals
    - Item #5: Student involvement in identification of strengths, needs, and preferences within the transition assessment process
- TAKE OFF! (Transition Activities Keeping Effective Options First and Foremost). This training is offered to teachers on how to create and execute an exit portfolio for students with disabilities in their senior year. TAKE OFF! is a set of activities designed to help teachers compile information to create a successful graduation packet. The portfolio training focuses on
    - how students can assist in writing their Summary of Performance (SOP)
    - storing all agency contacts and correspondence in a portfolio
    - maintaining student testing data relative to qualifying assessments for enrollment in post secondary schools
    - activities to engage parents in the transition process
  Districts have the opportunity to purchase student, parent and teacher manuals for TAKE OFF! implementation.
- Arkansas Transition Summit, February 6-7, 2008. The third annual transition summit will provide existing teams and new teams an opportunity to come together to focus on student focused planning and interagency collaboration, in an effort to improve post school outcomes for youth with IEPs. National speakers with expertise in these areas will present general sessions and breakout sessions. Arkansas teachers and agency personnel will also present successful programs in an effort to get other teachers to replicate them in their schools. Each team will have four separate planning sessions in which to assess their needs, set goals and develop an action plan to achieve those goals. Local team meetings will continue to be encouraged so teams continue making progress on their plans. It is anticipated that over 200 participants will be in attendance
- The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.
- College Bound 2008 will be held June 18-20, 2008 at UCA in Conway, AR.
- Implementing a plan to work with the Division on Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) to produce a program to be shown on AETN in the spring of 2009 which will explain more of the transition process including SSI, SSDI, applying for PASS plans, etc. This program will use easy to understand language with a focus on parents and students in an effort to increase their knowledge and understanding of what is available to them.
- Participation from various consultants on CASSP teams around the state.
- Plan and conduct Transition orientation nights for parents for each education cooperative area.
- Plan and conduct Transition fairs for students and families to learn about area agencies and services they provide.
- Sponsor Transition youth conferences throughout the State. Two youth conferences will be held in 2008, one in Southwest Arkansas and another in Southeast Arkansas in February targeting junior and senior high students with disabilities.
- Submit proposals for presentations on Transition activities at the state and national level.

- Attendance at the Secondary Transition State Planning Institute. Members of Arkansas Transition Services will attend this annual meeting in May 2008 to continue work on a state plan to improve indicator outcomes. The group will convene again in May 2009.
- Newsletters. Each Transition Consultant provides a monthly newsletter to teachers, supervisors and others in his service area with a focus on transition related issues and highlights of successful programs.
- College Camp at University of Arkansas at Little Rock. In collaboration with PEPNet, Arkansas Transition Services will provide assistance in recruiting attendees for a four day college camp for students with hearing impairments. The camp will provide a real-life picture of life on a college campus. Students will attend workshops and stay in dormitories. Arkansas Transition Services will provide an interactive workshop on self-determination. Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

The ADE Special Education Unit will launch the Arkansas Local Education Agency Resource Network (AR-LEARN) to assist in meeting the challenges of providing quality special education services to meet the needs of students in 21st century schools. Based out of the Dawson Education Services Cooperative, the mission of AR-LEARN is to promote sound research-based building and classroom educational practices to achieve the educational results required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), assisting the Arkansas Department of Education in responding to statewide needs as well as those of individual school districts. In the near future, customized technical assistance will be delivered on-site by independent special education consultants who can assist in helping any school district meet required IDEA State Performance Plan targets. The state wide professional development program is designed to build the capacity of local special education personnel and, to the extent appropriate, that of general educational professionals as well. Professional development credit will be awarded by the Dawson ESC for any training attended.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2007-08 will be surveyed in spring 2009 is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 3 (2007-08) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
0302	COTTER	3	1
0304	NORFORK	3	1
0802	EUREKA SPRINGS	3	1
1204	WEST SIDE	3	1
1704	MULBERRY	3	1
2503	VIOLA	3	1
2607	MOUNTAIN PINE	3	1
2901	BLEVINS	3	1
2906	SPRING HILL	3	1
4302	ENGLAND	3	1
4303	CARLISLE	3	1
4502	YELLVILLE-SUMMIT	3	1
5301	EAST END	3	1
5504	MURFREESBORO	3	1
5704	VAN COVE	3	1
5706	OUACHITA RIVER	3	1
6806	TWIN RIVERS	3	1
7304	WHITE COUNTY CENTRAL	3	1
7403	MCCRORY	3	1
7503	DANVILLE	3	1
7509	WESTERN YELL COUNTY	3	1
0404	GRAVETTE	3	2
2105	MCGEHEE	3	2
2404	OZARK	3	2
2602	FOUNTAIN LAKE	3	2
3001	BISMARCK	3	2
3105	NASHVILLE	3	2
4003	STAR CITY	3	2
4101	ASHDOWN	3	2
4713	OSCEOLA	3	2
6301	BAUXITE	3	2
6401	WALDRON	3	2
6502	SEARCY COUNTY	3	2
0406	SILOAM SPRINGS	3	3
1611	NETTLETON	3	3
1804	MARION	3	3
3509	WATSON CHAPEL	3	3
6602	GREENWOOD	3	3
3505	PINE BLUFF	3	4
5805	RUSSELLVILLE	3	4
6003	PULASKI COUNTY SPECIAL	3	5

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   ADE will compile a list of youth with IEPs from each district from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The information will be forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all of the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.

Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

P.O.I.S.E. staff will continue to conduct activities aimed at improving post school outcomes.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2008-09 will be surveyed in spring 2010 is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 4 (2008-09) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
0440	BENTON COUNTY SCHOOL OF ARTS	4	1
1203	QUITMAN	4	1
1505	WONDERVIEW	4	1
1601	BAY	4	1
1802	EARLE	4	1
1905	WYNNE	4	1
2306	MT. VERNON/ENOLA	4	1
2604	JESSIEVILLE	4	1
3102	DIERKS	4	1
3302	MELBOURNE	4	1
3810	LAWRENCE COUNTY	4	1
3809	HILLCREST	4	1
4801	BRINKLEY	4	1
5201	BEARDEN	4	1
5303	PERRYVILLE	4	1
6040	ACADEMICS PLUS CHARTER SCHOOL	4	1
6041	LISA ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	4	1
7007	PARKERS CHAPEL	4	1
7008	SMACKOVER	4	1
7104	SHIRLEY	4	1
7105	SOUTHSIDE	4	1
7240	THE ACADEMY	4	1
0407	PEA RIDGE	4	2
2303	GREENBRIER	4	2
3004	MALVERN	4	2
3601	CLARKSVILLE	4	2
5205	HARMONY GROVE	4	2
5602	HARRISBURG	4	2
5801	ATKINS	4	2
6701	DEQUEEN	4	2
7202	FARMINGTON	4	2
7205	LINCOLN	4	2
7307	RIVERVIEW	4	2
7504	DARDANELLE	4	2
7510	TWO RIVERS	4	2
0503	HARRISON	4	3
4605	TEXARKANA	4	3
5403	HELENA-WEST HELENA	4	3
7302	BEEBE	4	3
6002	NORTH LITTLE ROCK	4	4
6303	BRYANT	4	4
0405	ROGERS	4	5

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   ADE will compile a list of youth with IEPs from each district from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The information will be forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

The Fourth Annual Arkansas Transition Summit is set for October 1-2, 2009. The focus will be Family Involvement and Self-Determination. Previously identified teams will participate and continue work on current plans, as well as attend presentations by local and national presenters to revise and improve plans. Information on all the indicators will be discussed and plans will be developed by districts to improve outcomes for those indicators. Approximately 200 will attend.

Arkansas Transition Services will collaborate with PEPNet on a second camp planned for July 2009.

P.O.I.S.E. staff will continue to conduct activities aimed at improving post school outcomes.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2009-10 will be surveyed in spring 2011 is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 5 (2009-10) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
0505	VALLEY SPRINGS	5	1
0701	HAMPTON	5	1
1106	RECTOR	5	1
1408	EMERSON-TAYLOR	5	1
1703	MOUNTAINBURG	5	1
2703	POYEN	5	1
3003	MAGNET COVE	5	1
3201	BATESVILLE	5	1
3212	CEDAR RIDGE	5	1
3306	IZARD COUNTY	5	1
4901	CADDO HILLS	5	1
5106	DEER/MT. JUDEA	5	1
5206	STEPHENS	5	1
5401	BARTON-LEXA	5	1
5607	WEINER	5	1
6102	MAYNARD	5	1
6202	HUGHES	5	1
6205	PALESTINE/WHEATLEY	5	1
6304	HARMONY GROVE	5	1
6505	OZARK MOUNTAIN	5	1
7003	JUNCTION CITY	5	1
7401	AUGUSTA	5	1
0104	STUTTGART	5	2
0203	HAMBURG	5	2
0403	GENTRY	5	2
0801	BERRYVILLE	5	2
1202	HEBER SPRINGS	5	2
4401	HUNTSVILLE	5	2
4706	SOUTH MISSISSIPPI COUNTY	5	2
4712	MANILA	5	2
5006	PRESCOTT	5	2
6901	MOUNTAIN VIEW	5	2
7102	CLINTON	5	2
7301	BALD KNOB	5	2
1402	MAGNOLIA	5	3
1608	JONESBORO	5	3
2605	LAKE HAMILTON	5	3
4702	BLYTHEVILLE	5	3
6201	FORREST CITY	5	3
7203	FAYETTEVILLE	5	4

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   ADE will compile a list of youth with IEPs from each district from the Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The information will be forwarded to LifeTrack Services, Inc. to generate mailings, conduct telephone follow-ups and basic survey response analysis. ADE will receive a results analysis report from LifeTrack Services along with the raw data for additional analysis to be undertaken by the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office will provide district and statewide reports on the survey results to the ADE and the State partners in secondary and postsecondary education. This will provide them with valuable information on how the three priorities, as discussed in Indicators 1, 2 and 13, can be enhanced; thus, leading to improved secondary transition plans, as well as graduation and dropout rates.

P.O.I.S.E. staff will continue to conduct activities aimed at improving post school outcomes.

A list of schools whose post-school students from 2010-11 will be surveyed in spring 2012 is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Post School Outcomes Survey Districts by Sampling Year 6 (2010-11) and ADM Strata

LEA Number	District Name	Sampling Year	ADM Strata
0502	BERGMAN	6	1
0506	LEAD HILL	6	1
1003	GURDON	6	1
1104	PIGGOTT	6	1
1304	WOODLAWN	6	1
1901	CROSS COUNTY	6	1
2304	GUY-PERKINS	6	1
2502	SALEM	6	1
2601	CUTTER-MORNING STAR	6	1
2803	MARMADUKE	6	1
3005	OUACHITA	6	1
3606	WESTSIDE	6	1
4102	FOREMAN	6	1
4202	MAGAZINE	6	1
4802	CLARENDON	6	1
5404	MARVELL	6	1
5440	KIPP/ DELTA COLLEGE PREP SCHL	6	1
5503	KIRBY	6	1
5608	EAST POINSETT COUNTY	6	1
5901	DES ARC	6	1
6603	HACKETT	6	1
6703	HORATIO	6	1
7006	NORPHLET	6	1
7009	STRONG-HUTTIG SCHOOL DISTRICT	6	1
0101	DEWITT	6	2
0201	CROSSETT	6	2
1507	SO. CONWAY COUNTY	6	2
3002	GLEN ROSE	6	2
3201	BATESVILLE	6	2
3209	SOUTHSIDE	6	2
3604	LAMAR	6	2
3904	LEE COUNTY	6	2
5605	TRUMANN	6	2
6606	MANSFIELD	6	2
7201	ELKINS	6	2
7206	PRAIRIE GROVE	6	2
1701	ALMA	6	3
2307	VILONIA	6	3
2903	HOPE	6	3
6302	BENTON	6	3
1705	VAN BUREN	6	4
6001	LITTLE ROCK	6	6

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

The development of the Arkansas State Performance Plan (SPP) began in May 2005 with the appointment of a 40-member stakeholder group. This group consisted of consumers, parents, school officials, legislators, and other interested parties. Initial orientations to the SPP were provided to the stakeholders group as well as to the State Advisory Panel in June 2005.

In July 2005, a half-day working session was conducted for members of the stakeholder group and the State Advisory Panel. After a brief orientation, members were assigned to one of three task groups focusing on the establishment of measurable and rigorous targets, strategies for improving performance and steps necessary for obtaining broad-based public input. The recommendations and considerations generated by these task groups laid the foundation for the development of the Arkansas SPP.

After additional work to develop the content of the SPP around the 20 indicators, the SPP was presented to the State Advisory Panel in mid-October 2005 for its comments and modifications. Advisory Panel SPP changes were incorporated and presented to the 40-member stakeholder group in a series of conference calls in late October.

Further changes suggested by the stakeholder group were made in November 2005 while additional data and targets were assembled. The SPP was posted on the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Special Education website as a series of program area "mini-volumes" in mid-November 2005. Comments were solicited from the public on the SPP topics of FAPE in the LRE, pre- and post-school outcomes, child find, and special education over-representation.

Changes made to the SPP since its original dissemination are presented to the stakeholder group and State Advisory Panel. The feedback provided by these groups will be incorporated into the SPP for subsequent submissions.

Following the submission of the Arkansas APR on February 1, 2009, the Arkansas Department of Education - Special Education Unit (ADE-SEU) will utilize the ADE-SEU website as the primary vehicle for the annual dissemination of the APR on progress or slippage in meeting the SPP measurable and rigorous targets. Additionally, e-version copies of the APR, along with an explanatory cover letter from the Arkansas Commissioner of Education, will be sent to the headquarters of each public library operating within the Arkansas public library system. Further, an official press release will be prepared and provided to all statewide media outlets detailing how the public may obtain or review a copy of the APR. Lastly, the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will report annually to the public on each Local Education Agency's (LEA) performance against the SPP targets using the Special Education website as well as in an ongoing series of performance reports disseminated to statewide and local media outlets, primarily the print media.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 15: Identification and Correction of Noncompliance

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

Measurement

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year
   a. Number of findings of noncompliance

   b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Percent = [(*b*) divided by (*a*)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and or enforcement that the State has taken.

The OSEP SPP template for Indicator 15 is used to generate the baseline results.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

Components of the State's General Supervision System
The Arkansas Department of Education Special Education Unit is composed of the following sections:
Dispute Resolution Section (DRS)
Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE)
Non-Traditional Programs
State Program Development
Associate Director's Office
Grants/Data Management (G/DM)
Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Dispute Resolution: The Dispute Resolution Section (DRS) of the Special Education Unit of the Arkansas Department of Education is a component of the State's general supervision system. The DRS is responsible for managing the due process hearing system and the complaint investigation system both of which are required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended. Implementation of both systems was accomplished under an Arkansas state document titled IDEA Special Education and Related Services: Procedural Requirements and Program Standards (Arkansas Department of Education, 2000).

Coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services is the duty of the DRS with the legal mandate of ensuring effective general supervision. This goal is accomplished by resolving disputes in accordance with the federal and state regulations governing due process hearings and complaint investigations. In resolving issues requiring dispute resolution, the administrator of the DRS works closely with the administrator of the Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section and ADE Area Supervisors assigned to the M/PE Section to ensure prompt resolution to complaints filed with the DRS.

In addition to monitoring and enforcing compliance with corrective actions contained in hearing decisions or investigation reports, the DRS also sends monitors to make on-site inspections of school districts and

early childhood programs to determine actual and continued compliance. A member of the M/PE Section usually does the on-site follow-up visit.

In the case of a complaint, when violations are found and corrective actions are ordered by a hearing officer or the ADE's Director, the DRS monitors and enforces compliance with corrective actions by the public agency. The DRS works collaboratively with the public agency in achieving compliance, but the DRS has the duty to recommend to the Associate Director the withholding of funds from a public agency that is unable or unwilling to achieve compliance within a reasonable period, subject to notice and opportunity for a hearing on the issue of withholding of funds.

Additionally, compliance issues discovered during mediation and/or complaint investigations that are not part of the original complaint or mediation request are referred to the appropriate ADE Supervisor for further resolution before they escalate into larger procedural issues requiring formal complaint investigations or due process hearing resolutions.

The DRS also developed internal policies to ensure that due process hearing requests are assigned immediately to hearing officers on a rotational basis. In addition, internal policies, procedures, and practices were developed and implemented to ensure that complaint investigation reports were administratively complete within the required timeline.

The ADE established the Arkansas Special Education Mediation Project, which began providing mediation services to parents of students with disabilities and local education agencies and education service cooperatives in August 2003. The project is sponsored and funded by the Special Education Unit and is supervised by the U.A.L.R. Bowen School of Law in Little Rock. The project makes available mediation services to resolve disputes arising prior to the filing of a due process hearing request or complaint investigation request involving the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and provision of a free appropriate public education to students with disabilities as defined by the IDEA. Mediation services are free of charge to parents of students with disabilities and schools/co-ops. The pre-filing mediation program is designed to resolve disputes before a formal request is made for a due process hearing or a complaint investigation. Mediation services are intended to reduce costs and lessen hard feelings and intractable positions between parents of children with disabilities and schools/co-ops. The availability and use of this process does not obstruct access to the due process hearings or complaint systems.

Monitoring/Program Effectiveness and Non-Traditional Programs: While the M/PE Section is directly responsible for the oversight of the special education programs in the state's public schools and co-ops, the M/PE Section, in conjunction with the ADE's Non-Traditional Section, also oversees the implementation of special education programs in the State's open-enrollment Charter Schools, State operated and State supported programs, Juvenile Detention Facilities, and private agencies scattered throughout the state.

Additionally, the M/PE Section personnel work closely with the Grants/Data Management Section and the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office in carrying out the M/PE Section's overall supervision of the provision of special education and related services. Monitoring activities often raise issues in the area of Child Count Audits, provision of qualified providers, provision of adequate supplies and materials, facilities, and numerous other issues dealing with the expenditure of state and federal funds for special education and related services.

Because of the M/PE Section's role in overseeing the implementation of special education and related services to children with disabilities throughout the state in a variety of settings, monitoring activities often identify personnel and staff development issues that must be coordinated with the State's Program Development Administrator who oversees the State's professional development activities. By working in

conjunction with this Section, ADE Area Supervisors can assist the Administrator in developing and implementing in-service and staff development programs specifically designed to meet the needs of specific geographic areas throughout the state and, if needed, statewide activities.

The M/PE Section has intensified its working relationship with the ADE Special Education Associate Director's staff to ensure that students identified as needing special education and related services as defined by the IDEA are included in statewide and district-wide assessments. In addition, they work to ensure that students access educational programs through their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or participate in the general education environment that parallels those of their non-disabled peers.

Associate Director's Office: The Associate Director's staff primarily assists the Associate Director in designing and/or conducting activities associated with initiatives undertaken because of state and federal mandates. These include

- amending and/or developing state special education rules;
- assisting the Associate Director in monitoring and responding to the activities of the Arkansas General Assembly when it is in session;
- overseeing the development and implementation of the statewide alternate portfolio assessment for children with disabilities, as well as related statewide personnel training activities;
- assisting in the collection, review, analysis, and reporting of required LEA and state data; and,
- serving as a liaison for the Associate Director with other divisions within the ADE and outside agencies with whom we collaborate and cooperate. Associate Director's staff coordinates assignments with other sections of the ADE and the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office.

Grants/Data Management and the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office: The G/DM Section participates in general supervision by:

- identifying appropriate and effective use of federal, state, and local program funds through the budgeting process;
- analyzing required reporting from public agencies on the use of funds to achieve desired program outcomes including special grant reporting on spending and program results, early intervening, annual and mid-year Title VI-B, and Section 619 budget expenditure reports;
- conducting budget analysis on reimbursement programs such as state Catastrophic Occurrences and residential placements to ensure accurate requests and use of funds;
- ensuring intensive and timely interventions are imposed to correct noncompliance with federal requirements on spending levels;
- monitoring established deadlines for reporting and use of automation to ensure adherence to spending and reporting deadlines; and,
- providing direct technical assistance through easy access to ADE financial and technology staff, as well as the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office staff.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office: In 2004-05, the ADE initiated a partnership with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) College of Education to create the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office (http://arksped.k12.ar.us/sections/dataandresearch.html). This relocated the Special Education Data Manager to UALR for the purpose of providing quality data management, analysis, technical assistance, and research for the enhancement of the Arkansas Department of Education's general supervision mandate. In addition, the Office strives to promote IDEA research among faculty and students of UALR for a greater understanding of policy, procedures, and practices across the state.

Working in conjunction with the G/DM Section, the IDEA Data & Research Office ensures standardized data collection procedures for federal reporting, state and district level data analysis, and public

dissemination of program effectiveness data including school district and early childhood program profiles, Focused Monitoring Profiles, the State Performance Plan, and the Annual Performance Report.

The Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office coordinates with the ADE Sections on various projects by providing leadership and guidance in the areas of data collection and survey design as well as data related school district and co-op personnel training. They are active participants in the General Supervision Enhancement Grant early childhood and family outcomes project (GSEG), as well as in coordinating the SPP data requirements.

How the Components Function as a General Supervision System
The general supervision instruments and procedures, used by the ADE, identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner. These instruments include the coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services through the Dispute Resolution Section of the ADE Special Education Unit. While hearing officers conduct due process hearings, ADE Area Supervisors, through the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section, typically investigate complaints. The IDEA requires due process hearings to be completed within 45 days of filing, while complaints must be addressed within 60 days of filing.

M/PE Area Supervisors are responsible for monitoring special education programs within Arkansas school districts. This reporting period was the last one that operated solely on the "traditional" system of school IDEA compliance monitoring. In this system, these thirteen (13) issue areas were addressed during monitoring:

Child Find	Due Process/Procedural Safeguards
Protection in Evaluation	Individualized Education Programs (IEP)
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)	Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
Confidentiality	Personnel/Professional Development
Private School Placement	Use of Funds
Coordinated Service System	Local Applications
Full Educational Opportunity Goal	

In preparation for monitoring, an ADE Area Supervisor would contact the Local Education Agency (LEA) at least two weeks prior to an on-site visit. A General Program Checklist would be completed by the school district and requested information would be submitted to the ADE prior to the visit. The traditional system was based on a three-year rotational monitoring cycle, with one-third of all school districts monitored each year.

It became increasingly clear during 2002-03 that the traditional monitoring system focused almost entirely on compliance with procedural requirements to the exclusion of program effectiveness outcomes. A school district could meet all of the criteria on a compliance checklist and still have large numbers of children failing to make adequate educational progress from year to year. Alternatively, in some cases a district might produce results in its special education programs and not meet the procedural requirements of the IDEA. Procedural compliance and educational results were often disconnected.

For this reason, and in an attempt to learn more about actual outcomes at the school rather than just the district level, the special education monitoring system used by the ADE began to be revised. Planning was begun to supplement the traditional approach with a "focused" monitoring system based initially on a series of data-driven indicators to identify those districts most in need of intensive general supervision activities.

Indicators were developed and applied based on historical discipline, exiting, disproportionality, student performance data, and educational placement data. In addition to historical data, these indicators took into account the results of the three-year traditional monitoring cycle by focusing on numbers and severity of Compliance Action Plans (CAPs), founded complaints, and due process hearings.

The revised monitoring system was intended to address the need for focusing on areas of compliance that impacted the results for children. Conceptually, a system that previously focused on procedural compliance will now focus on program effectiveness and student results, while still ensuring that state laws and regulations are implemented and that protections guaranteed to students with disabilities and their parents are enforced. The new system was introduced to Arkansas school districts prior to the end of the 2002-03 school year through the issuance of a Director's Memo IA-03-057 on March 27, 2003.

In the 2004-05 school year, districts were no longer required to submit a written Compliance Action Plan to M/PE; instead, they were to incorporate their Compliance Action Plan into the Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). This permits the M/PE monitors to review the Compliance Action Plans through an ADE web site; thus, allowing a desk audit to be performed at any time throughout the year.

Correction of Noncompliance and Improved Performance
Throughout the monitoring system, the ADE imposes corrective strategies on the public agency, along with specific documentation to be submitted to demonstrate implementation of corrective actions. Under the revised system, individual public agencies will be required to conduct a self-assessment and develop a school wide improvement plan containing strategies to correct deficiencies, with corresponding timelines for review to gauge the effectiveness of their implementation of corrective actions. ADE personnel monitoring the public agency's effectiveness will require revisions if the efforts appear to be ineffective or not working.

Public agencies must submit written assurance or evidence that the deficiencies within a Compliance Action Plan have been corrected as directed. When written assurance is provided, evidence that documents the LEA's progress in correcting the noted deficiencies must be available at the public agency for review by ADE staff. Upon the receipt of all requested evidence listed in the Compliance Action Plan and completion of the corrective actions, ADE staff will notify the public agency of its compliance status.

DRS personnel review corrective strategies proposed by LEAs in light of corrective actions required in a hearing decision or complaint report. Strategies are required to meet the letter and intent of the corrective action which they address. At times, corrective strategies can be evaluated based upon documentation submitted to the ADE by an LEA. It is common for initial proposed corrective strategies to be insufficient in some substantive way in addressing the required corrective action. When the initial strategy is insufficient, the DRS works collaboratively with the LEA to prompt the actions necessary to achieve compliance. As needed, the ADE sends one or more monitors on site to determine if a public agency is complying with corrective actions.

An LEA under a corrective action directive in a hearing decision or complaint investigation report is required to submit documentation addressing the status of compliance with corrective actions within 30 days of the date the report was disseminated by the ADE. Effective correction of noncompliance in a timely manner is determined by documentation submitted by the public agency, on-site visits, and by monitoring activities conducted by the ADE Area Supervisors. The DRS also receives and evaluates feedback and objections to compliance activities or strategies from parents, attorneys, advocates, and other appropriate interested parties.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year
  a. Number of findings of noncompliance: 247
  b. Number of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification: 246

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year. 246/247 = 99.60%

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and or enforcement that the State has taken.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	A. There were 247 findings of noncompliance in 2003-04. The areas of noncompliance under a related monitoring priority were • Child Find • Due Process • Protection in Evaluation Procedures • Procedures for Evaluating Specific Learning Disability • Individualized Education Programs • Free Appropriate Public Education • Confidentiality Information • Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Noncompliance within the dispute resolution system focused on • Protection in Evaluation Procedures • Due Process • IEP development in accordance with regulations • IEP Implementation • Discipline • Denial of Free Appropriate Public Education • Early Childhood Transition Timelines • Appropriate Staff Training • Failure to meet Regulatory Timelines • Extended School Year • Unilateral Termination-Education Placement • Appropriate facilities B. Two hundred forty six (246) or 99.60% of corrections were completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. The one finding still outstanding addressed appropriate facilities. This district had to redesign its special education program, and while all other findings were corrected within one-year, it took 4 months beyond the one-year timeline to correct the appropriate facility finding.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Under the general supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) 100% of identified noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will review internal policy, procedures, and practices to ensure due process and complaint resolution timelines are met and revise internal operations accordingly. The ADE will develop and implement resolution sessions as part of the dispute resolution policy, procedures, and practices for the 2005-06 school year. For financial compliance, the G/DM Section posted the online survey questions below to be completed by LEAs when filing their annual Consolidated Application.

Did you budget Title VI-B funds for Early Intervening Services (EIS) as provided for at Section 613(f) in IDEA 2004?

    ○ No
    ○ Yes, my district budget includes $_____ for EIS.

Does your budget include any Title VI-B permissive uses of funds as specified at Section 613(a)(4) in IDEA 2004?

    ○ No
    ○ Yes, my district budget includes $_____ for Title VI-B permissive uses.

Did you use any Title VI-B funds in your budget for Title I school wide programs as provided for at Section 613(a)(2)(D) in IDEA 2004?

    ○ No
    ○ Yes, my district budget includes $_____ for Title I school wide programs.

If you answered Yes to any of the above, does your District's ACSIP include a narrative describing this use of Title VI-B funds?

    ○ No
    ○ Yes

Did you use the authority under Section 613(a)(2)(C) (the 50% provision) to reduce local expenditures due to an increase in Title VI-B funds?

    ○ No
    ○ Yes, my district budget reduced local expenditures by $_____.

The purpose of this survey was to validate the use of federal funds and each LEA's conformance to required ACSIP reporting. In addition, G/DM continued to use the State Education Accounting Manual rules to increase financial compliance on the use of federal funds and Medicaid for local special education services.

The M/PE Section will continue monitoring activities through the three-tier system, although the ADE will integrate a significant technology component into the compliance monitoring system. The ADE will seek to develop an Automated Monitoring Interface (*AMI*™) that will pull local IEP and due process compliance data electronically from LEAs into a central data repository. The *AMI*™ is

intended to replace the manual monitoring checklist and will give the ADE the opportunity to randomly monitor any special education program in the State without regard to the traditional three year cycle.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   As the Automated Monitoring Interface is fully deployed, the IDEA Data & Research Office will be asked by the ADE to conduct a series of analyses on the data from 2005-06. These data and statistical analyses will form the basis for electronic reviews of the timely evaluation data on an ongoing basis during 2006-07. Local special education staff will be trained on the methodology to be used by the IDEA Data & Research Office and the protocol for transferring statistical findings of compliance to the M/PE Section. The G/DM Section will develop protocols for ensuring the integrity of compliance data gathered electronically.

It is anticipated that the statistical findings of compliance will allow the development of district-specific electronic checklists that will allow the ADE to audit IEP compliance prior to site visits, thus allowing monitoring teams to focus on specific areas of compliance and needed corrective action of policy, procedures, or practices. The M/PE Section will incorporate the protocol for identifying inappropriate policy, procedures, and practices into the ADE Monitoring Procedural Handbook.

The ADE will continue to monitor IDEA compliance through fiscal reviews and focused monitoring. Internal reviews of policy and practice will be ongoing.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The AMI™ and monitoring protocol will be fully operational. The ADE continues the development of tools to assist LEAs with data integrity, compliance, and implementation of corrective actions. The ADE continues to monitor IDEA compliance through review of trigger and fiscal data. Internal reviews of LEA policies, procedures and practices will be ongoing.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will monitor LEA due process compliance through electronic reviews of district compliance data. The ADE continues the development of tools to assist LEAs with data integrity, compliance, and implementation of corrective actions. The ADE continues to monitor IDEA compliance through review of trigger and fiscal data. Internal reviews of LEA policies, procedures and practices will be ongoing.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will monitor LEA due process compliance through electronic reviews of district compliance data. The ADE continues the development of tools to assist LEAs with data integrity, compliance, and implementation of corrective actions. The ADE continues to monitor IDEA compliance through review of trigger and fiscal data. Internal reviews of LEA policies, procedures, and practices will be ongoing.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will monitor LEA due process compliance through electronic reviews of district compliance data. The ADE continues the development of tools to assist LEAs with data integrity, compliance, and implementation of corrective actions. The ADE continues to monitor IDEA compliance through review of trigger and fiscal data. Internal reviews of LEA policies, procedures and practices will be ongoing.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 16: Complaint Timelines
Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

See Attachment 1

Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1 (c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
Components of the State's General Supervision System
The Arkansas Department of Education Special Education Unit includes a Dispute Resolution Section (DRS). The Dispute Resolution Section (DRS) of the Special Education Unit of the Arkansas Department of Education is a component of the State's general supervision system. The DRS is responsible for managing the due process hearing system and the complaint investigation system both of which are required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended. Implementation of both systems was accomplished under an Arkansas state document titled IDEA Special Education and Related Services: Procedural Requirements and Program Standards (Arkansas Department of Education, 2000).

Coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services is the duty of the DRS with the legal mandate of ensuring effective general supervision. This goal is accomplished by resolving disputes in accordance with the federal and state regulations governing due process hearings and complaint investigations. In resolving issues requiring dispute resolution, the administrator of the DRS works closely with the administrator of the Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section and ADE Area Supervisors assigned to the M/PE Section to ensure prompt resolution to complaints filed with the DRS.

In addition to monitoring and enforcing compliance with corrective actions contained in hearing decisions or investigation reports, the DRS also sends monitors to make on-site inspections of school districts and early childhood programs to determine actual and continued compliance. A member of the M/PE Section usually does the on-site follow-up visit.

In the event violations are found and corrective actions ordered by a hearing officer or ADE's Director in the case of a complaint, the DRS monitors and enforce compliance with corrective actions by the public agency. The DRS works collaboratively with the public agency in achieving compliance, but the DRS has the duty to recommend to the Associate Director the withholding of funds from a public agency that is unable or unwilling to achieve compliance within a reasonable period, subject to notice and opportunity for a hearing on the issue of withholding of funds.

Additionally, compliance issues discovered during mediation and/or complaint investigations that are not part of the original complaint or mediation request are referred to the appropriate ADE Supervisor for further resolution before they escalate into larger procedural issues requiring formal complaint investigations or due process hearing resolutions.

The DRS also has developed internal policies to ensure that due process hearing requests are assigned immediately to hearing officers on a rotational basis. In addition, internal policies, procedures, and practices

were developed and implemented to ensure that complaint investigation reports were administratively complete within the required timeline.

How the Components Function as a General Supervision System

The general supervision instruments and procedures used by the ADE identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner. These instruments include the coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services through the Dispute Resolution Section of the ADE Special Education Unit. While hearing officers conduct due process hearings, ADE Area Supervisors, through the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section, typically investigate complaints. The IDEA requires due process hearings to be completed within 45 days of filing, while complaints must be addressed within 60 days of filing.

Correction of Noncompliance and Improved Performance

Throughout the monitoring system, the ADE imposes corrective strategies on the public agency along with specific documentation to be submitted to demonstrate implementation of corrective actions. Under the revised system, individual public agencies will be required to conduct a self-assessment and develop a school wide improvement plan containing strategies to correct deficiencies, with corresponding timelines for review to gauge the effectiveness of their implementation of corrective actions. ADE personnel monitoring the public agency's effectiveness will require revisions if the efforts appear to be ineffective or not working.

Public agencies must submit written assurance or evidence that the deficiencies within a Compliance Action Plan have been corrected as directed. When written assurance is provided, evidence that documents the LEA's progress in correcting the noted deficiencies must be available at the public agency for review by ADE staff. Upon the receipt of all requested evidence listed in the Compliance Action Plan and completion of the corrective actions, ADE staff will notify the public agency of its compliance status.

DRS personnel review corrective strategies proposed by LEAs in light of corrective actions required in a hearing decision or complaint report. Strategies are required to meet the letter and intent of the corrective action which they address. At times, corrective strategies can be evaluated based upon documentation submitted to the ADE by an LEA. It is common for initial proposed corrective strategies to be insufficient in some substantive way in addressing the required corrective action. When the initial strategy is insufficient, the DRS works collaboratively with the LEA to prompt the actions necessary to achieve compliance. As needed, the ADE sends one or more monitors on site to determine if a public agency is complying with corrective actions.

An LEA under corrective action directive in a hearing decision or complaint investigation report is required to submit documentation addressing the status of compliance with corrective actions within 30 days of the date the report was disseminated by the ADE. Effective correction of noncompliance in a timely manner is determined by documentation submitted by the public agency, on-site visits, and by monitoring activities conducted by the ADE Area Supervisors. The DRS also receives and evaluates feedback and objections to compliance activities or strategies from parents, attorneys, advocates, and other appropriate interested parties.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

1) Signed, written complaints totals   35
    (1.1) Complaints with reports issued   28
        (a) Reports with findings   25
        (b) Reports within timeline   28
        (c) Reports within extended timelines   0
    (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed   7
    (1.3) Complaints pending   0
      (a) Complaint pending a due process hearing   0

    ((28 + 0)/ 28) = 100 percent compliance

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	In 2005, Arkansas had 35 signed, written complaints, of which 28 reports were issued while seven (7) complaints were withdrawn or dismissed. There were 25 complaint reports with findings and 3 without findings; all reports were issued within timelines. As of June 30, 2005, there were zero complaints pending.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will review internal policy, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's system are adequate.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue to review internal policy, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The ADE will investigate the need to update the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS needs and federal reporting requirements. The DRS

will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The ADE will initiate an update to the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

A Compliance Specialist will be hired for the Dispute Resolution Section to work with schools, parents, mediators, and Due Process Complaint Hearing Officers concerning Complaint Investigations and Due Process Complaint Hearings.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The ADE will transition from the original system to the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The ADE will fully implement the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The DRS will conduct training for the M/PE Section on how to perform effective complaint investigations as needed. The ADE will evaluate the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 17: Due Process Timelines

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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

See Attachment 1

Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

Components of the State's General Supervision System

The Arkansas Department of Education Special Education Unit includes a Dispute Resolution Section (DRS). The DRS of the Special Education Unit of the Arkansas Department of Education is a component of the State's general supervision system. The DRS is responsible for managing the due process hearing system and the complaint investigation system, both of which are required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended. Implementation of both systems was accomplished under an Arkansas state document titled IDEA Special Education and Related Services: Procedural Requirements and Program Standards (Arkansas Department of Education, 2000).

Coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services is the duty of the DRS with the legal mandate of ensuring effective general supervision. This goal is accomplished by resolving disputes in accordance with the federal and state regulations governing due process hearings and complaint investigations. In resolving issues requiring dispute resolution, the administrator of the DRS works closely with the administrator of the Monitoring/Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section and ADE Area Supervisors assigned to the M/PE Section to ensure prompt resolution of complaints filed with the DRS.

In addition to monitoring and enforcing compliance with corrective actions contained in hearing decisions or investigation reports, the DRS also sends monitors to make on-site inspections of school districts and early childhood programs to determine actual and continued compliance. A member of the M/PE Section usually does the on-site follow up visit.

In the event violations are found and corrective actions ordered by a hearing officer or the ADE's Director in the case of a complaint, the DRS monitors and enforce compliance with corrective actions by the public agency. The DRS works collaboratively with the public agency in achieving compliance, but the DRS has the duty to recommend to the Associate Director the withholding of funds from a public agency that is unable or unwilling to achieve compliance within a reasonable period, subject to notice and opportunity for a hearing on the issue of withholding of funds.

Additionally, compliance issues discovered during mediation and/or complaint investigations that are not part of the original complaint or mediation request are referred to the appropriate ADE Supervisor for further resolution before they escalate into larger procedural issues requiring formal complaint investigations or due process hearing resolutions.

The DRS also has developed internal policies to ensure that due process hearing requests are assigned immediately to hearing officers on a rotational basis. In addition, internal policies, procedures, and practices

were developed and implemented to ensure that complaint investigation reports were administratively complete within the required timeline.

How the Components Function as a General Supervision System
The general supervision instruments and procedures used by the ADE identify and correct IDEA noncompliance in a timely manner. These instruments include the coordination of due process hearings, complaint investigations, and pre-filing mediation services through the Dispute Resolution Section of the ADE Special Education Unit. While hearing officers conduct due process hearings, ADE Area Supervisors, through the Monitoring and Program Effectiveness (M/PE) Section, typically investigate complaints. The IDEA requires due process hearings to be completed within 45 days of filing while complaints must be addressed within 60 days of filing.

M/PE Area Supervisors are responsible for monitoring special education programs within Arkansas school districts. This reporting period was the last one that operated solely on the "traditional" system of school IDEA compliance monitoring. In this system, these thirteen (13) issue areas were addressed during monitoring:

Child Find	Due Process/Procedural Safeguards
Protection in Evaluation	Individualized Education Programs (IEP)
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)	Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
Confidentiality	Personnel Professional Development
Private School Placement	Use of Funds
Coordinated Service System	Local Applications
Full Educational Opportunity Goal	

In preparation for monitoring, an ADE Area Supervisor would contact the Local Education Agency (LEA) at least two weeks prior to an on-site visit. A General Program Checklist would be completed by the school district and requested information would be submitted to the ADE prior to the visit. The traditional system was based on a three-year rotational monitoring cycle, with one-third of all school districts monitored each year.

It became increasingly clear during 2002-03, that the traditional monitoring system focused almost entirely on compliance with procedural requirements to the exclusion of program effectiveness outcomes. A school district could meet all of the criteria on a compliance checklist and still have large numbers of children failing to make adequate educational progress from year to year. Alternatively, in some cases a district might produce results in their special education programs and not meet the procedural requirements of the IDEA. Procedural compliance and educational results were often disconnected.

For this reason, and in an attempt to learn more about actual outcomes at the school rather than just the district level, the special education monitoring system used by the ADE began to be revised. Planning was begun to supplement the traditional approach with a "focused" monitoring system based initially on a series of data-driven indicators to identify those districts most in need of intensive general supervision activities.

Indicators were developed and applied based on historical discipline, exiting, disproportionality, student performance data, and educational placement data. In addition to historical data, these indicators took into account the results of the three-year traditional monitoring cycle by focusing on numbers and severity of Compliance Action Plans (CAPs), founded complaints, and due process hearings.

The revised monitoring system was intended to address the need for focusing on areas of compliance that impacted the results for children. Conceptually, a system that previously focused on procedural compliance will now focus on program effectiveness and student results, while still ensuring that state laws and regulations are implemented and that protections guaranteed to students with disabilities and their parents are enforced. The new system was introduced to Arkansas school districts prior to the end of the 2002-03 school year through the issuance of Director's Memo IA-03-057 on March 27, 2003.

In the 2004-05 school year, districts were no longer required to submit a written Compliance Action Plan to M/PE, instead they were to incorporate their Compliance Action Plan into the Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan (ACSIP). This permits the M/PE monitors to review the Compliance Action Plans through an ADE web site; thus, allowing a desk audit to be performed at any time throughout the year.

Correction of Noncompliance and Improved Performance
Throughout the monitoring system, the ADE imposes corrective strategies on the public agency, along with specific documentation to be submitted that demonstrates implementation of corrective actions. Under the revised system, individual public agencies will be required to conduct a self-assessment and develop a school wide improvement plan containing strategies to correct deficiencies, with corresponding timelines for review, to gauge the effectiveness of their implementation of corrective actions. ADE personnel monitoring the public agency's effectiveness will require revisions if the efforts appear to be ineffective or not working.

Public agencies must submit written assurance or evidence that the deficiencies within a Compliance Action Plan have been corrected, as directed. When written assurance is provided, evidence that documents the LEA's progress in correcting the noted deficiencies must be available at the public agency for review by ADE staff. Upon the receipt of all requested evidence listed in the Compliance Action Plan and completion of the corrective actions, ADE staff will notify the public agency of its compliance status.

DRS personnel review corrective strategies proposed by LEAs in light of corrective actions required in a hearing decision or complaint report. Strategies are required to meet the letter and intent of the corrective action which they address. At times, corrective strategies can be evaluated based upon documentation submitted by an LEA to the ADE. It is common for initial proposed corrective strategies to be insufficient in some substantive way in addressing the required corrective action. When the initial strategy is insufficient, the DRS works collaboratively with the LEA to prompt the actions necessary to achieve compliance. As needed, the ADE sends one or more monitors on site to determine if a public agency is complying with corrective actions.

An LEA under corrective action directive in a hearing decision or complaint investigation report is required to submit documentation addressing the status of compliance with corrective actions within 30 days of the date the report was disseminated by the ADE. Effective correction of noncompliance in a timely manner is determined by documentation submitted by the public agency, on-site visits, and by monitoring activities conducted by the ADE Area Supervisors. The DRS also receives and evaluates feedback and objections to compliance activities or strategies from parents, attorneys, advocates, and other appropriate interested parties.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

(3) Hearing requests total	29	
(3.1) Resolution sessions	N/A	
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A	
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	5	
(a) Decisions within timeline	0	
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	5	
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	22	

$$((5 + 0) / 5) = 100 \% \text{ compliance}$$

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	In 2005, Arkansas had a total of 29 due process hearing requests. Five (5) were fully adjudicated with all decisions made within extended timelines. In addition, 22 hearing requests were resolved without a hearing. Furthermore, 2 expedited hearing requests were made in relation to disciplinary actions.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will review internal policy, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's system are adequate.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue to review internal policy, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The ADE will investigate the need to update the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS needs and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008) The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The ADE will initiate an update to the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

A Compliance Specialist will be hired for the Dispute Resolution Section to work with schools, parents, mediators, and Due Process Complaint Hearing Officers concerning Complaint Investigations and Due Process Complaint Hearings.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009) The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The ADE will transition from the original system to the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010) The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The ADE will fully implement the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011) The ADE will continue to review internal policies, procedures, and practices to ensure due process hearings are completed in a timely manner and will take appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. The ADE will conduct training for Hearing Officers as needed. The ADE will evaluate the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 18: Hearing Requests Resolved by Resolution Session

Percent of hearing requests resolved by resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

See Attachment 1

Percent = (3.1(a)) divided by (3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

Components of the State's General Supervision System

Dispute Resolution: The Dispute Resolution Section (DRS) of the Special Education Unit of the Arkansas Department of Education is a component of the State's general supervision system. The DRS is responsible for managing the due process hearing system and the complaint investigation system both of which are required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended. Implementation of both systems was accomplished under an Arkansas state document titled IDEA Special Education and Related Services: Procedural Requirements and Program Standards (Arkansas Department of Education, 2000).

The DRS is responsible for managing the due process hearing system and the complaint investigation system, both of which are required by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended. In addition, the DRS will implement the resolution session requirement in accordance with IDEA, as amended.

RESOLUTION SESSION-
(i) PRELIMINARY MEETING- Prior to the opportunity for an impartial due process hearing under subparagraph (A), the local educational agency shall convene a meeting with the parents and the relevant member or members of the IEP Team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the complaint.

 (I)   within 15 days of receiving notice of the parents' complaint;
 (II)   which shall include a representative of the agency who has decision making authority on behalf of such agency;
(III)   which may not include an attorney of the local educational agency unless the parent is accompanied by an attorney; and
(IV)   where the parents of the child discuss their complaint and the facts that form the basis of the complaint, and the local educational agency is provided the opportunity to resolve the complaint unless the parents and the local educational agency agree in writing to waive such meeting, or agree to use the mediation process described in subsection (e).

(ii) HEARING-If the local educational agency has not resolved the complaint to the satisfaction of the parents within 30 days of the receipt of the complaint, the due process hearing may occur, and all of the applicable timelines for a due process hearing under this part shall commence.

(iii) WRITTEN SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT- In the case that a resolution is reached to resolve the complaint at a meeting described in clause (i), the parties shall execute a legally binding agreement that is--

 (I)   signed by both the parent and a representative of the agency who has the authority to bind such

agency; and

(II)   enforceable in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

(iv) REVIEW PERIOD- If the parties execute an agreement pursuant to clause (iii), a party may void such agreement within 3 business days of the agreement's execution.

Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006)

In 2005-06, there were 20 hearing requests of which 12 resolution sessions were held with six settlement agreements reached. Therefore, 50% of hearing requests that went to resolution were resolved by resolution session.

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Not applicable
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	50% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	51% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	52% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	53% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	54% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	55% hearing requests resolved by resolution session.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will disseminate the statutory changes governing due process hearings, which include the availability of Resolution Sessions. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policy, procedures, and practices associated with conducting Resolution Sessions. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue to disseminate information and provide training relative to conducting Resolution Sessions as part of the dispute resolution system. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policy, procedures, and practices of resolution sessions. The ADE will investigate the need to update the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS needs and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue to disseminate information and provide training relative to conducting Resolution Sessions as part of the dispute resolution system. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policies, procedures, and practices of resolution sessions. The ADE will initiate an update to the existing data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

A Compliance Specialist will be hired for the Dispute Resolution Section to work with schools, parents, mediators, and Due Process Complaint Hearing Officers concerning Complaint Investigations and Due Process Complaint Hearings.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will continue to disseminate information and provide training relative to conducting Resolution Sessions as part of the dispute resolution system. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policies, procedures, and practices of resolution sessions. The ADE will transition from the original system to the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will implement training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue to disseminate information and provide training relative to conducting Resolution Sessions as part of the dispute resolution system. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policies, procedures, and practices of resolution sessions. The ADE will fully implement the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will continue training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue to disseminate information and provide training relative to conducting Resolution Sessions as part of the dispute resolution system. The DRS will provide professional development training for ADE staff, Hearing Officers, and LEA staff on the policies, procedures, and practices of resolution sessions. The ADE will evaluate the updated data entry application for dispute resolution tracking to meet DRS and federal reporting requirements. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will continue training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements
Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

See Attachment 1

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1 (b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
The ADE established the Arkansas Special Education Mediation Project, which began providing mediation services to parents of children with IEPs and local education agencies and education service centers in August 2003. The project is sponsored and funded by the Special Education Unit and is supervised by the U.A.L.R. Bowen School of Law in Little Rock. The project makes available mediation services to resolve disputes arising prior to the filing of a due process hearing request or complaint investigation request involving the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and provision of a free appropriate public education to children with IEPs as defined by the IDEA. Mediation services are free of charge to parents of children with IEPS and schools/co-ops. The pre-filing mediation program is designed to resolve disputes before a formal request is made for a due process hearing or a complaint investigation. Mediation services are intended to reduce costs and lessen hard feelings and intractable positions between parents of children with IEPs and schools/co-ops. This availability and use of this process does not obstruct access to the due process hearing or complaint systems.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

(2) Mediation requests total	22
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	1
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(b) Mediations not related to due process	17
(i) Mediation agreements	12
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	4

((13/18) x 100) = 72.22%

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	Arkansas anticipated that approximately 60% of all mediations requested would result in a mediation agreement. In 2005, Arkansas had 22 districts request mediation. There was one (1) mediation session related to due process and 17 not related to due process. Of the 18 mediations held, 13 reached agreements. In addition, four (4) mediations were not held. No mediations were pending as of June 30, 2005. Seventy-two percent (72%) of mediations requested resulted in mediation agreements.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	Seventy-two percent (72.2%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	Seventy-two percent (72.5%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	Seventy-two percent (73.0%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	Seventy-two percent (73.5%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Seventy-two percent (74.0%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Seventy-five percent (75.0%) of mediations requested will result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will review the mediation agreement with the UALR Bowen Law School to ensure the Arkansas Special Education Mediation Project is meeting the needs of children with IEPs. The ADE will continue its efforts to promote the Arkansas Special Education Mediation Project to LEAs, advocates, and families of children with IEPs. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE-SEU will continue to encourage the use of mediation, contracting with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Bowen School of Law Mediation Center to conduct mediation sessions for parents and public agencies (local school districts) on any matters in dispute concerning the provision of education to students with and without disabilities. The ADE-SEU will contract with the Arkansas PTI to provide services to encourage parents and schools to consider the benefits of mediation to resolve their educational disputes. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE-SEU will continue to encourage the use of mediation, contracing with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Bowen School of Law Mediation Center to conduct mediation sessions for parents and public agencies (local school districts) on any matters in dispute concerning the provision of education to students with and without disabilities. The ADE-SEU will also continue to contract with the Arkansas PTI to provide services to encourage parents and schools to consider the benefits of mediation to resolve their educational disputes. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will develop training for use with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

A Compliance Specialist will be hired for the Dispute Resolution Section to work with schools, parents, mediators, and Due Process Complaint Hearing Officers concerning Complaint Investigations and Due Process Complaint Hearings.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE-SEU will continue to encourage the use of mediation, contracting with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Bowen School of Law Mediation Center to conduct mediation sessions for parents and public agencies (local school districts) on any matters in dispute concerning the provision of education to students with and without disabilities. The ADE-SEU will also continue to contract with the Arkansas PTI to provide services to encourage parents and schools to consider the benefits of mediation to resolve their educational disputes. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In

addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will implement training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE-SEU will continue to encourage mediation, contracting with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Bowen School of Law Mediation Center to conduct mediation sessions for parents and public agencies (local school districts) on any matters in dispute concerning the provision of education to students with and without disabilities. The ADE-SEU will also continue to contract with the Arkansas PTI to provide services to encourage parents and schools to consider the benefits of mediation to resolve their educational disputes. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will continue training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE-SEU will continue to encourage the use of mediation, contracting with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Bowen School of Law Mediation Center to conduct mediation sessions for parents and public agencies (local school districts) on any matters in dispute concerning the provision of education to students with and without disabilities. The ADE-SEU will also continue to contract with the Arkansas PTI to provide services to encourage parents and schools to consider the benefits of mediation to resolve their educational disputes. The DRS will participate in meetings and trainings conducted by CADRE and other organizations to ensure the State's systems are adequate. In addition, the ADE, in conjunction with partner organizations, will continue training with parents and schools on building positive parent and school partnerships.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

Indicator 20: State Reported Data
State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Measurement

State reported data, including Section 618 data and annual performance reports are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and

b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process
To the maximum extent possible, Arkansas special education data are generated from district-level data entered into the statewide Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). This includes data for Section 618 reporting as well as for data used in the ADE's general supervision activities. APSCN is a mature mainframe system that is used by districts for day-to-day school functions relating to student management and financial processing.

Each year, APSCN school data are collected during seven cycles, from September through June, and reported to the ADE through the Statewide Information System (SIS). The SIS is a relational database that organizes APSCN data for use in a variety of federal and state education reports. District- and student -level special education data from SIS tables and from five APSCN special education modules are provided to the ADE on cycle and stored locally on ADE SQL servers for analysis, updates, and modification prior to OSEP submission or use in general supervision activities.

Examples of district-level data used for general supervision derived from APSCN include special education provider qualifications and caseload counts, Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring (CIFM) statistical indicators, and special education financial management records. Certain district-level data used in general supervision activities are generated outside of the APSCN environment. Examples of these types of data include special education due process complaints and hearings, program effectiveness measurements, school-based mental health services and outcomes, and Arkansas benchmark assessment results.

Regardless of the originating source, all ADE data used for general supervision activities are maintained by the Special Education Data Manager (the data manager also serves as the director of the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office). This full-time position is directly responsible for identifying and collecting appropriate statistical and empirical data, compiling and analyzing data on the SQL data storage platforms, preparing data in formats suitable for public posting on the ADE website, and for establishing effective and accurate data management protocols. The Special Education Data Manager is also the single point of contact for districts and APSCN for any data corrections, updates, or clarifications of required special education data.

In 2004-05, the ADE initiated a partnership with the University of Arkansas at Little Rock College of Education. The partnership established the Arkansas IDEA Data & Research Office, whose mission is to provide quality data management, analysis, technical assistance, and research for the enhancement of the Arkansas Department of Education's general supervision of local education agencies' special education programs by ensuring accurate, valid, and timely data to meet all state and federal reporting. That Office

strives to promote IDEA research among faculty and students of UALR for a greater understanding of policy, procedures, and practices across the state.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005)

    a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, and placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance

    b. Accurate: 100% compliance

Discussion of Baseline Data

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2004 (2004-2005)	In 2004-05, all reports were submitted to OSEP on or before the due dates. However, the December 1 child count report had to be resubmitted after an error was identified. Although the totals matched, there was a misalignment in the data table. The correction was made and a new data table was submitted to Westat and OSEP. The State takes great strides to ensure the data is timely and accurate. Districts have the opportunity to review and correct their data after submitting to APSCN via the special education website. Reports are generated directly from the special education SQL server using Crystal Reports. The staff then cross-references each report looking for inconsistencies within the data tables.
FFY 2005 (2005-2006)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.
FFY 2006 (2006-2007)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.
FFY 2007 (2007-2008)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.
FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports): 100% compliance b. Accurate: 100% compliance.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

FFY 2005 (2005-2006)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website at http://arksped.k12.ar.us/.

The ADE has been awarded a grant by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences, totaling $3,328,503 over three years, for the construction of a longitudinal data system that will enable the ADE to more effectively manage, analyze, disaggregate, and use individual student data to support decision making at the state, district, school, classroom, and parent levels, in order to eliminate achievement gaps and improve learning of all students. Special Education data collection and analysis will be improved through this federal grant.

Final decisions will be made on Early Childhood program outcomes and data collection through the 2004 General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG). The automated platforms between Part C and Part B service providers will facilitate successful child transitions and due process compliance. The collection of program-specific early childhood outcomes will be formulated for evaluation against state targets.

At the direction of the ADE, the IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users. These trainings will be face-to-face and web-based and conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staff. The Special Education Data Manager and other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

FFY 2006 (2006-2007)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website.

At the direction of the ADE, the IDEA Data & Research Office will establish a Data Summit to address the collection and use of Arkansas special education data in relation to the APR and determination. The Summit will be for the purpose of disseminating information on data collection best practices, planning with local special education personnel on new special education data collections such as for post-school outcomes and parent involvement, and for the development of a special education data community of practice.

The ADE will continue to implement the requirements of the longitudinal data systems grant awarded by the USDE Institute of Education Sciences.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users. In addition to training provided at the two-day Data Summit, trainings will be face-to-face and web-based and conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staffs. The Special Education Data Manager and other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

FFY 2007 (2007-2008)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website. The IDEA Data & Research Office will generate a series of Performance Profiles for each LEA in addition to the Monitoring Profiles. Performance Profiles are

intended to allow each LEA to see its overall compliance standing with respect to state levels and other school districts.

The ADE will continue to implement the requirements of the longitudinal data systems grant awarded by the USDE Institute of Education Sciences.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will expand to include the former contract programmer at APSCN. As an IDEA Data & Research Office employee, the functions of the position remain the same ─ the development and maintenance of the special education module and the extraction of data required to meet State and USDE requirements. Additionally, a training coordinator position will be established to oversee and conduct all trainings related to the use of APSCN and MySped Resource as well as reporting requirements.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will develop and disseminate a monthly newsletter. The newsletter will discuss upcoming data submissions, training opportunities, and important resources. The newsletter will be e-mailed to all LEA special education supervisors and early childhood coordinators. The first issue is scheduled for release in September 2007.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users through face-to-face and web-based formats. Training will be conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staffs. The Special Education Data Manager and other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

The ADE will continue to pursue technology solutions to data collection requirements in the interest of paperwork reduction.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will participate in and utilize the State's bi-annual Special Education Conference known as Special Show as a local education agency training opportunity.

The Director of the IDEA Data & Research Office was invited to serve on the national advisory group for the Data Accountability Center. The Director accepted the offer and will participate in all advisory meetings.

FFY 2008 (2008-2009)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website. The IDEA Data & Research Office will generate a series of Performance Profiles for each LEA in addition to the Monitoring Profiles. Performance Profiles are intended to allow each LEA to see its overall compliance standing with respect to state levels and other school districts.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users through face-to-face and web-based formats.

Training will be conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staffs. The Special Education Data Manager and/or other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

The ADE will continue to pursue technology solutions to data collection requirements in the interest of paperwork reduction.

FFY 2009 (2009-2010)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website. The IDEA Data & Research Office will generate a series of Performance Profiles for each LEA in addition to the Monitoring Profiles. Performance Profiles are intended to allow each LEA to see its overall compliance standing with respect to state levels and other school districts.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will host a two-day Data Summit to address the Indicators of the SPP.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users through face-to-face and web-based formats. Training will be conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staffs. The Special Education Data Manager and/or other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

The ADE will continue to pursue technology solutions to data collection requirements in the interest of paperwork reduction.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will participate in and utilize the State's bi-annual Special Education Conference known as Special Show as a local education agency training opportunity.

 FFY 2010 (2010-2011)   The ADE will continue the development of a seamless and public data environment for the purpose of increasing the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of data used in general supervision activities. The primary vehicle for public and restricted reviews of special education data will continue to be the Special Education website. The IDEA Data & Research Office will generate a series of Performance Profiles for each LEA in addition to the Monitoring Profiles. Performance Profiles are intended to allow each LEA to see its overall compliance standing with respect to state levels and other school districts.

The IDEA Data & Research Office will continue regular training with local special education data users through face-to-face and web-based formats. Training will be conducted in conjunction with APSCN, DDS, or other ADE program and data administration staffs. The Special Education Data Manager and/or other data staff will attend the OSEP/Westat Data Manager Meeting and other conferences that address data collection for the various monitoring indicators such as post-school outcomes.

The ADE will continue to pursue technology solutions to data collection requirements in the interest of paperwork reduction.

APPENDIX

- Attachment 1: Table 7, Hearings, Complaints, and Mediations (2004-05)

- Attachment 2: Family Involvement Survey (2005-06)

- Attachment 3: Post School Outcomes Survey (2006-07)

Attachment 1: Hearings, Complaints, and Mediation
2004-05

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	35
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	28
(a) Reports with findings	25
(b) Reports within timeline	28
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	7
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	22
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	1
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(b) Mediations not related to due process	21
(i) Mediation agreements	12
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	3

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	29
(3.1) Resolution sessions	NA
(a) Settlement agreements	NA
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	5
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	5
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	22

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	2
(4.1) Resolution sessions	
(a) Settlement agreements	
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0

Attachment 2: Family Involvement Survey: Early Childhood
2005-06

The Arkansas Special Education Early Childhood Family Outcomes Survey

This is a survey for parents/families of children receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each question, please fill in the bubble that best describes your family right now. If a statement almost, but not quite, describes your family select the number just below the statement. For example, if the statement under 3 almost describes your family, select the 2.

Use No. 2 pencil only.

Make dark marks that fill the oval completely.

Correct Mark ●

Incorrect Marks ⊘ ⊗

Understanding your child's strengths, abilities, and special needs

1. Your child is growing and learning. How well do you understand your child's development?

We are just beginning to understand our child's development. ①	②	We have a basic understanding of our child's development, but we still have a lot to learn. ③	④	We have a pretty good understanding of our child's development. ⑤	⑥	We understand our child's development very well. ⑦

2. Some children have special health needs, a disability, or are delayed in their development. How much do you know about your child's special needs?

Right now we do not know very much. ①	②	We have learned some things, but we still have a lot of unanswered questions. ③	④	We know a lot, but we still need or want to know more. ⑤	⑥	We are confident that we know most of what we need to know right now. ⑦

3. Professionals who work with you and your child want to know if the things they do are working. Are you able to tell if your child is making progress?

Right now, we cannot tell if our child is making progress. ①	②	We sometimes can tell if my/our child is making progress, but we still have a lot to learn. ③	④	We can usually tell if our child is making progress. ⑤	⑥	We can almost always tell if our child is making progress. ⑦

Knowing your rights and advocating for your child

4. A variety of programs and services may be available for your child and family. Do you know what is available for your child and family?

We are just beginning to learn about the programs and services that are available. ①	②	We know about some programs and services, but still have a lot to learn. ③	④	We think we are aware of most available programs and services. ⑤	⑥	We are very aware of the programs and services that are available. ⑦

5. Parents often meet with professionals to plan services or activities. How comfortable are you participating in these meetings?

Right now we are very uncomfortable participating in meetings. ①	②	We are not very comfortable participating in meetings, but we do it anyway. ③	④	We are pretty comfortable participating in meetings. ⑤	⑥	We are very comfortable participating in meetings. ⑦

6. Families of children with special needs have rights, and there are things you can do if you are not satisfied. How well do you know your rights and what to do if you are not satisfied?

We are not sure about our rights or what to do if we are not satisfied. ①	②	We understand our basic rights but are not sure about all of our options if we are not satisfied. ③	④	We think we know most of our rights and what to do if we are not satisfied. ⑤	⑥	We are very aware of our rights and know exactly what to do if we are not satisfied. ⑦

Helping your child develop and learn

7. All parents help their children develop and learn, but sometimes it is hard to know what to do. How would you describe your ability to help your child develop and learn?

We need to know a lot more about how to help our child develop and learn. ①	②	We know the basics of helping our child develop and learn, but still have many questions. ③	④	We feel pretty sure that we know how to help our child develop and learn. ⑤	⑥	We are very sure that we know how to help our child develop and learn. ⑦

8. All parents try to help their children learn to behave the way they would like, but sometimes it is hard to know what to do. How would you describe your ability to help your child learn to behave the way you would like?

We need to know a lot more about how to help our child learn to behave like we want. ①	②	We know the basics of helping our child behave, but still have many questions. ③	④	We feel pretty sure that we know how to help our child behave. ⑤	⑥	We are very sure that we know how to help our child behave. ⑦

9. Professionals have worked with you to develop a plan to help your child learn new skills and behaviors. How much are you able to help your child learn or practice these new skills at home or in your community?

We have not yet started to help our child learn or practice these skills and behaviors. ①	②	We have started to help our child learn and practice these skills and behaviors, but it is not a regular thing yet. ③	④	We often help our child learn and practice these skills and behaviors, but it is not as regular as we would like. ⑤	⑥	We regularly help our child learn and practice these skills and behaviors throughout the day. ⑦

10. To what extent has your child's preschool program encouraged you to be actively involved in your child's education at school? Our child's preschool has…

not encouraged us to be actively involved in our child's education at school ①	②	done a few things to encourage us to be actively involved in our child's education at school ③	④	a good job of encouraging us to be actively involved in our child's education at school ⑤	⑥	an excellent job of encouraging us to be actively involved in our child's education at school ⑦

Source: The questions and scale was developed by Don Bailey, Kathy Hebbeler, and Mary Beth Bruder as part of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, a cooperative agreement (#H324L030002) to SRI International from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education.

11576

Attachment 2: Family Involvement Survey: School Age
2005-06

The Arkansas Special Education School Age Family Outcomes Survey

This is a survey for parents/families of students receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices: very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, or very strongly agree. You may skip any item you feel does not apply to you or your child.

LEA

NOT APPLICABLE
VERY STRONGLY AGREE
STRONGLY AGREE
AGREE
DISAGREE
STRONGLY DISAGREE
VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE

| Use number 2 pencil only. | Make dark marks that fill the oval completely. | Correct Mark ● | Incorrect Marks ⌀ ⊘ ⊙ |

BUILDING

1. I was offered special assistance (such as childcare or transportation) so that I could participate in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) meeting.

2. All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.

3. I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.

4. Teachers and administrators ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards (the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents).

5. The school communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.

6. The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.

7. My child is taught in regular classes, with supports, to the maximum extent appropriate.

8. General education and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented.

9. Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family get services that my child and family need.

10. Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family know about my child and family's rights concerning special education services.

11. I value the school's input concerning my child.

12. I meet with my child's teacher(s) to plan my child's program and services.

13. I participate in the school's PTA (Parent Teacher Association) or PTO (Parent Teacher Organization).

14. Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family understand my child's special needs.

15. Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family feel that my efforts are helping my child.

Source: The survey questions were developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring. http://www.monitoringcenter.lsuhsc.edu

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

10501

Mark Reflex® forms by Pearson NCS MM265350-2   321   ED06   Printed in U.S.A.

USE A NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY.

Attachment 3: Post School Outcomes Survey
2006-07

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE (SDP)

Please update name and address information below if applicable.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

POST-SCHOOL SURVEY (PSS)

EMPLOYMENT SECTION

1. **Right now** are you working?
   - ① NO, GO TO QUESTION #5
   - ② YES, GO TO QUESTIONS #2, #3, AND #4 – IF MORE THAN 1 JOB, ANSWER FOR JOB WITH THE MOST HOURS/WEEK
   - ㉙ No Answer

2. Where is the job? - (**Mark one option**)
   - ① in an integrated competitive employment setting
   - ② in your home
   - ③ in the military
   - ④ in a jail or prison
   - ⑤ in sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)
   - ⑥ in supported employment (paid work in a community with support services)
   - ㊳ other (Specify) _____
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

3. Are you usually paid at least minimum hourly wage?
   - ① NO
   - ② YES
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

4. Do you usually work 35 or more hours per week?
   - ① NO
   - ② YES
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

GO TO POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION

5. At any time since leaving high school, **have you ever worked?**
   - ① NO, GO TO POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION
   - ② YES, GO TO QUESTIONS #6, #7, #8
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

6. Describe the job – (if more than one job, describe the one held the longest) – (**mark one option**)
   - ① in an integrated competitive employment setting
   - ② in your home
   - ③ in the military
   - ④ in a jail or prison
   - ⑤ in sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)
   - ⑥ in supported employment (paid work in a community with support services)
   - ㊳ other (Specify) _____
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

7. Were you usually paid at least minimum hourly wage?
   - ① NO
   - ② YES
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

8. Did you usually work 35 or more hours per week?
   - ① NO
   - ② YES
   - ㊆ Not Applicable
   - ㉙ No Answer

GO TO POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION

POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION ON BACK SIDE ➙

Mark Reflex® forms by Pearson NCS MM267590-1   321   ED99   Printed in U.S.A.

POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL SECTION

9. *Right now*, are you enrolled in any type of school, training, or education program?
   - ① NO, GO TO QUESTION #12
   - ② YES, GO TO QUESTION #10 AND #11
   - ⑰ Not Applicable
   - ⑨⑨ No Answer

10. Describe the kind of school or training program *(Mark one option)*
    - ① High school completion document or certificate (e.g., Adult Basic Education, GED)
    - ② Short-term education or employment training program (e.g., WIA, Job Corps, etc.)
    - ③ Vocational Technical School -- less than a two-year program
    - ④ Community or Technical College (e.g., 2-year college)
    - ⑤ College/University (e.g., 4-year college)
    - ⑥ Enrolled in studies while incarcerated
    - ⑧⑧ Other (Specify): _____
    - ⑰ Not Applicable
    - ⑨⑨ No Answer

11. Are you enrolled full-time?
    - ① NO
    - ② YES
    - ⑰ Not Applicable
    - ⑨⑨ No Answer
    - **DATA COLLECTION COMPLETED**

12. At any time since leaving high school, *have you ever* been enrolled in any type of school, training, or education program (if more than one, describe the program enrolled in the longest)?

    - ① NO, DATA COLLECTION COMPLETED
    - ② YES, GO TO QUESTION #13 AND #14
    - ⑰ Not Applicable
    - ⑨⑨ No Answer

13. Describe the kind of school or training program *(Mark ONE OPTION)*
    - ① High school completion document or certificate (Adult Basic Education, GED)
    - ② Short-term education or employment training program (WIA, Job Corps, etc.)
    - ③ Vocational Technical School -- less than a two-year program
    - ④ Community or Technical College (2-year college)
    - ⑤ College/University (4-year college)
    - ⑥ Enrolled in studies while incarcerated
    - ⑧⑧ Other (Specify): _____
    - ⑰ Not Applicable
    - ⑨⑨ No Answer

14. Were you enrolled full-time?
    - ① NO
    - ② YES
    - ⑰ Not Applicable
    - ⑨⑨ No Answer
    - **DATA COLLECTION COMPLETED**

15. Gender ① Female   ② Male

16. Age ○ 15 ○ 16 ○ 17 ○ 18 ○ 19 ○ 20 ○ 21 ○ 22

17. Last grade completed in school ○ 9 ○ 10 ○ 11 ○ 12

18. Grade referred to special ed program
    ○ PreK ○ K ○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 ○ 6 ○ 7 ○ 8 ○ 9 ○ 10 ○ 11 ○ 12

①	④	⑦
②	⑤	⑧
③	⑥	⑨

①	⑥	⑪
②	⑦	⑫
③	⑧	⑬
④	⑨	⑭
⑤	⑩	⑮

Thank you for participating.
The information you provide is very important and will improve special education services