

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 74.7%. In its FFY 2007 APR, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator for FFY 2007. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table required the State to submit data based on the required measurement for this indicator in its FFY 2008 APR. The State reported that its FFY 2008 data were based on the required measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not report in the narrative for this indicator how many findings were issued in FFY 2007, how many were corrected in a timely manner, and how many were subsequently corrected. The State reported, in Indicator 1, that "letters of findings of noncompliance were issued in June, 2009 for FFY 2008 to all fifteen POEs." That statement appears to relate to findings identified in FFY 2008.</p> <p>In Indicator 9, the State reported that none of the 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for Indicator 1 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not report on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>As required by OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table, the State reported information regarding the 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR due February 1, 2011, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the 15 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program with the 15 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>						
		<p>to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>						
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.5%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 98.7%.</p>	<p>The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments are at or greater than 95%. There is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and assumes that the State is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance with 34 CFR §§303.12, 303.18, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii).</p>						
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1128 1444 1339"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1128 919 1263">08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 1128 1192 1263"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 1128 1444 1263"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1263 919 1339"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional</td> <td data-bbox="919 1263 1192 1339">70.1</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1263 1444 1339">48.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional	70.1	48.1	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>						
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional	70.1	48.1						

<sup>1</sup> Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	skills (including social relationships) (%)																								
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	61.8	28.8																						
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	57.3	29.1																						
	<p>The measurement for this indicator requires States to report on the functional outcomes of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: (1) positive social-emotional skills; (2) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; and (3) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. However, OSEP notes a large discrepancy in the denominator between functional outcomes A/B and outcome C, i.e., 135 for Functional Outcome A, 132 for Functional Outcome B, and 67 for Functional Outcome C. Denominators should be consistent across all outcome areas or have only a slight variation in data. The State reported that, in the future, the N size will be consistent across all outcome areas.</p>																								
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 976 1478 1369"> <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. Know their rights (%)</td> <td>83.2</td> <td>86.48</td> <td>84.2</td> <td>3.28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td>76.6</td> <td>92.01</td> <td>75.3</td> <td>15.41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td>89.0</td> <td>92.68</td> <td>90.1</td> <td>3.68%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met all of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a</p>					FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights (%)	83.2	86.48	84.2	3.28%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	76.6	92.01	75.3	15.41%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	89.0	92.68	90.1	3.68%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																					
A. Know their rights (%)	83.2	86.48	84.2	3.28%																					
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	76.6	92.01	75.3	15.41%																					
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	89.0	92.68	90.1	3.68%																					

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	response group that is representative of its population.	
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0.74%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 0.65%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0.76%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 2.90%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 2.54%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 2.50%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>In Indicator 7, the State reported that “all fifteen (15) POEs were issued findings of noncompliance in FFY 2007.” However, in Indicator 9, the State reported that 3 of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for Indicator 7 were corrected in a timely manner. In Indicator 7, for the findings identified in FFY 2007, the State did not report that it verified that each EIS program has completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State reported that it was unable to verify whether the children were still within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.</p> <p>As required by OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table, the State reported information regarding the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, and the three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State must also clarify, in the FFY 2009 APR, how many findings were identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator, and demonstrate that those findings were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 89%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported, in Indicator 8, that it was unable to verify the correction</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>of any of the 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator. The State reported that it is unable to verify whether the children were still within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The State did not report that it verified that each EIS program completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not report on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the 15 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 92.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported, in Indicator 8, that it was unable to verify the correction of any of the 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator. The State reported that it is unable to verify whether the children were still within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The State did not report that it verified that each EIS program completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not report on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the 15 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR,</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 89.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported, in Indicator 8C, that it was unable to verify the correction of any of the 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator. The State reported that it is unable to verify whether the children were still within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The State did not report that it verified that each EIS program completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not report on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>As required by OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table, the State reported information regarding the four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and the fifteen findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the 15 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>9. General Supervision system (including monitoring complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 13.63%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 80%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of the 44 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not provide information on the correction of the remaining noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02 that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.</p> <p>On pages 28-29 of its FFY 2008 APR, the State reported that it was not able to "verify child specific correction of noncompliance." The State reported that it revised its monitoring system in July 2009, and that it will now be able to verify correction of noncompliance at the child level.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State's FFY 2008 reported data for Indicator 9 does not include any findings of noncompliance for Indicators 8A or 8B, but the State</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In its FFY 2009 APR, under Indicator 9, the State must report on the correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, including any findings for Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02,</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>reported in its April 12, 2010 memorandum to OSEP that the 15 findings reported in Indicator 8 of its FFY 2008 APR relate to Indicators 8A and 8B, as well as 8C.</p>	<p>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 EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 38 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, and 8C in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>10. Percent of signed written</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in</p>

**Kentucky Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>In its FFY 2008 APR, the State reported 26 complaints were filed, eight were withdrawn, and 18 were resolved within the required timelines. The State also reported in its FFY 2008 data under IDEA section 618 that 100% of the complaints were resolved within the required timelines, but indicated that 19 complaints were filed.</p>	<p>achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.7%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>