

Minnesota Part C 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 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 99.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 98.0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. Although the State reported that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1), in its January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter, OSEP informed the State that it could not determine whether the State was verifying correction consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02), and required the State to submit specified documentation within 60 days from the date of that letter. OSEP has reviewed the State's March 25, 2010 submission and it is still unclear whether the State has verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP's analysis and request for additional information are set forth in Indicator 9 of this response table.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the State's data demonstrating that it 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>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>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 §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(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 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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
		the correction.												
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 94.50%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93.8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 92%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>												
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities 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="548 760 1444 1304"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 760 919 894">08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 760 1192 894"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 760 1444 894"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 894 919 1029">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 894 1192 1029">64.1</td> <td data-bbox="1192 894 1444 1029">40.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1029 919 1198">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1029 1192 1198">68.2</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1029 1444 1198">40.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1198 919 1304">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1198 1192 1304">68</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1198 1444 1304">42.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.1	40.4	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	68.2	40.7	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	68	42.7	<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> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.1	40.4												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	68.2	40.7												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	68	42.7												
<p>4. Percent of families participating</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>												

¹ 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.

² 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.

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 293 1482 686"> <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 align="center">77</td> <td align="center">81</td> <td align="center">85</td> <td align="center">4.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td align="center">83</td> <td align="center">87</td> <td align="center">86</td> <td align="center">4.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td> <td align="center">87</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">93</td> <td align="center">3.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 4B and did not meet its targets for 4A and 4C.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights (%)	77	81	85	4.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	83	87	86	4.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	87	90	93	3.00%	<p>improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. Know their rights (%)	77	81	85	4.00%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	83	87	86	4.00%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	87	90	93	3.00%																		
<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) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are .79%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of .62%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of .80%.</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) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 2.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 1.83%. The State met its target of 2.1%.</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>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 83.4%. The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator were 83.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008,</p>																				

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that all 28 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. Although the State reported that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), in its January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter, OSEP informed the State that it could not determine whether the State was verifying correction consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, and required the State to submit specified documentation within 60 days from the date of that letter. OSEP has reviewed the State’s March 25, 2010 submission and it is still unclear whether the State has verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP’s analysis and request for additional information are set forth in Indicator 9 of this response table.</p> <p>As part of its September 2009 verification visit to Minnesota, OSEP conducted a focused monitoring visit to address the 45-day timeline requirements under Indicator 7. As requested in OSEP’s January 27, 2010 Minnesota Verification Visit and Focused Monitoring Letter, the State revised its improvement activities in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</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>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 FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 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>A. IFSPs with transition steps and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. Although the State reported that it</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 IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>services; [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), in its January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter, OSEP informed the State that it could not determine whether the State was verifying correction consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02, and required the State to submit specified documentation within 60 days from the date of that letter. OSEP has reviewed the State's March 25, 2010 submission and it is still unclear whether the State has verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP's analysis and request for additional information are set forth in Indicator 9 of this response table.</p>	<p>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 FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (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 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>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 59%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State did not provide information on any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 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 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>If the State does not report 100%</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must also report, in the FFY 2009 APR, on why it did not make findings based on the FFY 2007 data that the State reported under this indicator, given that the FFY 2007 data reflected noncompliance.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 209 of 227 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that 18 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010. However, as noted below, the State has not demonstrated timely correction of the 209 findings.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter required the State to submit, within 60 days from that letter, written documentation of the specific procedures MDE uses, including the types and amount of data it examines, to verify that each EIS program/district is currently in compliance with the specific regulatory requirements that formed the basis of a finding of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP’s letter also required that the documentation explain how the updated data confirming current (subsequent to the finding) compliance with the specific regulatory requirements are representative (as opposed to the use of a single self-selected record).</p> <p>With respect to the requirement that the State verify that each EIS program with noncompliance has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, the State’s March 25, 2010 response to the Verification Visit Letter indicated that MDE reviews “at least 20% of the documents demonstrating correction for child-specific noncompliance, and requires districts to submit a statement of assurance verifying correction of all remaining noncompliance.” Accordingly, the State has demonstrated that it verifies that each EIS program with noncompliance has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program,</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 by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Although it is unclear whether the State verified correction of noncompliance findings 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>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, and 8A in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>With respect to the requirement that the State verify that each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, the State reported, on page 2 of its March 25, 2010 letter, that it requires LEAs [EIS programs] with noncompliance “to submit a district-generated CAP [corrective action plan] to address noncompliance associated with other regulatory requirements found to be systemic and to change, if needed, any policies, procedures or practices in the district [EIS program]. MDE requires a review of updated data for a specific time period in response to CAP directives in order to ensure that the district is currently implementing specific regulatory requirements correctly.”</p> <p>The State did not, as part of its March 25, 2010 response, provide the type and amount of data it examines to verify that the EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. It remains unclear whether: (1) the State verifies that an LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing updated data from the LEA if the State has not identified “systemic noncompliance” and required a CAP; and (2) the State has verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>OSEP’s January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter also required the State to submit, with its FFY 2010 Part C application: (1) written confirmation that it has issued findings against (or verified correction by) those districts for whom MDE has found noncompliance through its fiscal monitoring in FFYs 2008 and 2009; and (2) a written assurance that it will make findings of noncompliance based on noncompliance identified through fiscal monitoring. With its FFY 2010 Part C application, the State provided a signed memorandum in which it: (1) assured that it shall review the State database compliance data at least annually and issue findings for any noncompliance reflected by that data; and (2) confirmed that it has verified correction of individual student noncompliance and has issued findings during FFY 2009 for those districts for which MDE has FFY 2007 data indicating noncompliance with Indicators C1, C7, and C8.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>In response to the State’s March 25, 2010 verification letter response submission, the State must provide by July 30, 2010: (1) documentation of the types (monitoring, data base, etc.) and the specific amount of data (number of records, period of time, etc.) it examines, to verify that an EIS program is currently in compliance with the specific regulatory requirements that formed the basis of any finding of noncompliance (whether child-specific, systemic or the basis of a CAP), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02; and (2) an explanation of how the updated data confirming current (subsequent to the finding) compliance with the specific regulatory requirements are representative of the compliance data generally. OSEP will review the State’s submission, and inform the State of any additional action that may be required.</p> <p>In order to respond to the finding in OSEP’s Verification Visit Letter, the State</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>must also: (1) confirm in Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR that it has included findings of noncompliance that it was required to make as result of the required actions identified in the General Supervision Critical Elements 1 and 2 sections of the Verification Visit Letter (findings of noncompliance based on fiscal monitoring) and report on the correction of those findings in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012; and (2) provide to OSEP by July 30, 2010 copies of those fiscal findings referenced in the State's March 25, 2010 verification letter response submission.</p>
<p>10. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it did not issue State complaint decisions during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2008 reporting period. OSEP's January 27, 2010 Verification Visit Letter indicated that the State had corrected the timeline and other due process hearing issues identified during the verification visit.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to provide targets or improvements activities until any</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.	
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that all three mediations conducted during the FFY 2008 reporting period resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which less than ten 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 reported FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. 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.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>