

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.8%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator were 99.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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 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</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>								
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the target for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target for FFY 2010 and the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The revised FFY 2010 target is more rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 95.45%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 92.50%.</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: 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the Summary Statement 1 targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised FFY 2010 targets for Summary Statement 1 and the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1446 1583 1515"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1446 1010 1515"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="1010 1446 1192 1515"><u>FFY 2008</u></th> <th data-bbox="1192 1446 1381 1515"><u>FFY 2009</u></th> <th data-bbox="1381 1446 1583 1515"><u>FFY 2009</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>										

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>	
meet their needs. [Results Indicator]		<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>		
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	64.1	63.8	66		
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	68.2	65.1	70		
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	68	67.3	70		
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b>		
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	40.4	42.2	41		
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	40.7	42.2	42		
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	42.7	44.2	44		
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.					
	4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for 4A and 4C for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>the family:                      A. Know their rights;                      B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs; and                      C. Help their children develop and learn.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised FFY 2010 targets for 4A and 4C and the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The revised FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 342 1583 716"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Know their rights (%)</td> <td align="center">81</td> <td align="center">82</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td align="center">87</td> <td align="center">89</td> <td align="center">88</td> <td align="center">2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">92</td> <td align="center">96</td> <td align="center">2.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 target for 4B and did not meet its FFY 2009 targets for 4A and 4C.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	Know their rights (%)	81	82	90	1.00%	Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	87	89	88	2.00%	Help their children develop and learn (%)	90	92	96	2.00%	<p>data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
Know their rights (%)	81	82	90	1.00%																		
Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	87	89	88	2.00%																		
Help their children develop and learn (%)	90	92	96	2.00%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the target for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts the revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target for FFY 2010 and the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The revised FFY 2010 target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .74%. The State’s FFY 2008 data for this indicator were .79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of .85%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the target for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts the revision. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target for FFY 2010 and the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The revised FFY 2010 target is less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.15%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 2.10%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 2.25%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>																				

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are 77.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 83.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings.</p> <p>The State reported that all 34 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State did not provide an explanation for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings and the State must provide the required information for FFY 2009 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>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 2010 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 services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008. The State reported that it made 56 findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data in FFY 2009, and will report on correction of those findings in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, 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 demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR that the 56 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator and each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) (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 2010 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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>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 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</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>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 95.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>In addition, the State reported that it made 116 findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data in FFY 2009, and will report on correction of those findings in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the 116 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator, and each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 and 2008 data: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 92.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 223 of 229 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the six remaining findings subsequently</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501,</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to provide certain information related to the verification of correction and regarding fiscal findings of noncompliance by July 30, 2010. The State submitted the required information.</p>	<p>and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance for this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on the correction of the noncompliance described in this</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>
		table under those indicators.
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one complaint. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 2009. The State is not required to meet its targets in any fiscal year in which ten or less mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting</p>

**Minnesota Part C FFY 2009 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>requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>