

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 81%. Because FSM's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in FSM's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. FSM met its FFY 2007 target of 76%.</p> <p>FSM provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 3%. Because FSM's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in FSM's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. FSM did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 2.5%.</p> <p>FSM provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets FSM's minimum "n" size that meet FSM's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Indicator 3A is not applicable to FSM.</p>	

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In FFY 2008 FSM did not administer a math assessment to students with or without disabilities.</p> <p>FSM’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 41.3% for reading. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 66%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 80% for reading.</p> <p>FSM provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: www.fsmed.fm and www.fsmped.org/dashboard.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.2% for reading. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 3%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 12% for reading.</p> <p>FSM provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: www.fsmed.fm and www.fsmped.org/dashboard.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to FSM’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 0%. Because FSM’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in FSM’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. FSM met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>FSM reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is not applicable to FSM.</p>	

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]</p>																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="583 885 1493 1352"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">84</td> <td align="center">84</td> <td align="center">97.75</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">7</td> <td align="center">6</td> <td align="center">.25</td> <td align="center">1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">7</td> <td align="center">8</td> <td align="center">1.75</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data remain unchanged for 5A, represent progress for 5B and represent slippage for 5C from the FFY 2007 data. FSM did not meet any of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	84	84	97.75	0.00%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7	6	.25	1.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7	8	1.75	-1.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to FSM's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	84	84	97.75	0.00%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	7	6	.25	1.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7	8	1.75	-1.00%																		

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps									
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>FSM is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that FSM must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>									
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP.</p> <p>FSM's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="583 898 1478 1317"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="583 898 953 1015">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="953 898 1228 1015"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1228 898 1478 1015"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="583 1015 953 1149">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="953 1015 1228 1149">79.5</td> <td data-bbox="1228 1015 1478 1149">65</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="583 1149 953 1317">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="953 1149 1228 1317">80</td> <td data-bbox="1228 1149 1478 1317">65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	79.5	65	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	80	65	<p>FSM must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²									
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	79.5	65									
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	80	65									

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	87	68.3	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 83%. FSM met its FFY 2008 target of 75%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, FSM addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Indicator 9 is not applicable to FSM.</p>			
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Indicator 10 is not applicable to FSM.</p>			
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if FSM establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 83%. FSM did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>FSM reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY</p>			<p>FSM must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that FSM is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because FSM reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, FSM must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data FSM reported for this</p>

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. Although FSM reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s April 30, 2010 letter reporting on its 2009 verification visit (OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter) found that FSM’s procedures do not consistently verify that each LEA³ with noncompliance is: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each case of student-specific noncompliance (even if late for timeline requirements), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Therefore, FSM has not demonstrated that noncompliance has been corrected.</p> <p>FSM was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on FSM’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance. FSM reported on the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, FSM must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data FSM reported for this indicator and each of the LEAs with the 2 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If FSM does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p>	<p>Indicator 12 is not applicable to FSM.</p>	

³ Each reference to “LEA” in this Response Table refers to a State within FSM. Any reference to “State” refers to FSM.

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>FSM reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. Although FSM reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter found that FSM’s procedures do not consistently verify that each LEA with noncompliance is: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each case of student-specific noncompliance (even if late for timeline requirements), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, FSM has not demonstrated that noncompliance has been corrected.</p> <p>FSM reported that the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 for this indicator was corrected.</p> <p>In addition, OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter found that FSM did not have procedures for monitoring compliance with secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b). That letter required FSM to submit within 60 days of the date of that letter a revised Child Record Review Checklist and/or other monitoring protocols that are aligned with secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) and information demonstrating that all LEAs (FSM States) are reporting data consistent with 34 CFR §300.320(b).</p> <p>FSM was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on FSM’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance. FSM reported on the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, FSM must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>OSEP will respond to FSM under separate cover after it receives the information required by April 30, 2010 Verification Letter.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs</p>	<p>FSM is not required to provide actual target data, targets, or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed,</p>

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		<p>improvement activities.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 75%. FSM met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>FSM reported that all ten findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. Although FSM reported that it verified correction of noncompliance, OSEP’s April 30, 2010 Verification Letter found that FSM’s procedures do not consistently verify that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each case of student-specific noncompliance (even if late for timeline requirements), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. FSM reported that the remaining two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p> <p>FSM reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 was corrected.</p> <p>FSM was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on FSM’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates FSM’s efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified in FFY 2007.</p> <p>Although OSEP found that the State did not verify correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and OSEP Memo 09-02 was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a</p>

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>assistance. FSM reported on the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2007 APR Response Table required FSM to provide information in its FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2010 addressing issues identified in OSEP's July 17, 2007 Verification Letter. In addition, by letter dated July 1, 2009, FSM was placed on Special Conditions (Special Conditions Letter) for its FFY 2009 grant award and was required to submit two Progress Reports. With the exception of one item involving the requirement to submit a monitoring manual, all of the requirements listed in Indicator 15 in the FFY 2007 APR Response Table were reiterated in the Special Conditions Letter and some of those requirements were subsequently amended by OSEP in response to requests by FSM. Because OSEP's April 30, 2010 Verification Letter also required that FSM submit a revised monitoring manual within 60 days of the date of that letter, this Table will not address that issue. Accordingly, this Table will not address the requirements listed in Indicator 15 in the FFY 2007 APR Response Table.</p> <p>OSEP responded on March 5, 2010 to FSM's First Progress Report submitted as required by OSEP's Special Conditions Letter. FSM submitted its second Progress Report on May 15, 2010. OSEP will respond to that submission in its FFY 2010 Grant Award Letter, expected on July 1, 2010.</p>	<p>review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system, and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>OSEP will respond to FSM's May 15, 2010 Second Progress Report in its FFY 2010 Grant Award Letter, expected on July 1, 2010.</p> <p>OSEP will respond to FSM under separate cover after it receives the information required by OSEP's 2010 Verification Letter.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization)</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2008 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in FSM.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>FSM reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2008 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2008 reporting period.</p> <p>FSM reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2008. FSM is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>FSM reported that no mediations were held during the FFY 2008 reporting period.</p> <p>FSM reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. FSM is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing FSM's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>FSM's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 91%. FSM met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>FSM was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates FSM's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR</p>

FSM Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	based on FSM’s FFYs 2006 and 2007 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2008 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance; and (2) the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance. FSM reported on the technical assistance sources from which FSM received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions FSM took as a result of that technical assistance.	§§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, FSM must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.