

**Missouri 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 2010, for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 87.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 90.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007 or FFY 2008. The State reported that no findings were issued, because prior to issuance of findings, State staff verified that all noncompliance had been corrected. However, in its revised FFY 2009 APR, submitted on April 18, 2011, the State reported that it did not review updated data, other than the data for children for whom services were delayed, to determine if each EIS program with noncompliance was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it verified correction of the identified noncompliance prior to issuing a finding.</p> <p>The State reported in the FFY 2009 APR that it has changed its procedures for correction of all noncompliance to include a review of new data to verify that EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), in addition to verifying that individual child noncompliance is corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, 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 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 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 2010</p>

**Missouri 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>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>For noncompliance the State attempted to verify as corrected prior to issuing findings, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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 indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.2%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 95%.</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</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 indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement</p>

**Missouri 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>(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>OSEP’s FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to include in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, revised FFY 2010 targets to show improvement over the baseline. The State revised the targets, improvement activities and FFY 2010 baseline for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets for FFY 2010. The revised targets for Summary Statement 1 are more rigorous than the previously-established targets, and the revised targets for Summary Statement 2 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="548 526 1583 1505"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">76.0</td> <td align="center">69.1</td> <td align="center">68.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">74.8</td> <td align="center">70.3</td> <td align="center">67.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">80.0</td> <td align="center">73.0</td> <td align="center">72.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">59.4</td> <td align="center">47.4</td> <td align="center">53.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">57.1</td> <td align="center">45.5</td> <td align="center">51.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td align="center">46.3</td> <td align="center">36.1</td> <td align="center">41.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	76.0	69.1	68.4	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	74.8	70.3	67.3	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	80.0	73.0	72.0	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.4	47.4	53.5	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	57.1	45.5	51.4	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	46.3	36.1	41.7	<p>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 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	76.0	69.1	68.4																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	74.8	70.3	67.3																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	80.0	73.0	72.0																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	59.4	47.4	53.5																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	57.1	45.5	51.4																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	46.3	36.1	41.7																															

**Missouri Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 196 1583 228"> <tr> <td>meet their needs (%)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>				meet their needs (%)																				
meet their needs (%)																									
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 581 1583 954"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Know their rights (%)</td> <td align="center">94.6</td> <td align="center">96.1</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">1.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</td> <td align="center">95.6</td> <td align="center">97.6</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td align="center">97.4</td> <td align="center">98.5</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">1.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p>					<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. Know their rights (%)	94.6	96.1	95	1.50%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	95.6	97.6	95	2.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	97.4	98.5	95	1.10%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																					
A. Know their rights (%)	94.6	96.1	95	1.50%																					
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)	95.6	97.6	95	2.00%																					
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	97.4	98.5	95	1.10%																					
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</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. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are .84%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of .75%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of .82%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>																				

**Missouri 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>indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.72%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.55%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.64%.</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 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 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 95%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007 or FFY 2008. The State reported that no findings were issued, because prior to issuance of findings, State staff verified that all noncompliance had been corrected. However, in its revised FFY 2009 APR, submitted on April 18, 2011, the State reported that it did not review updated data, other than the data for children who did not receive an initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting within the 45-day timeline, to determine if each EIS program with noncompliance was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it verified correction of the identified noncompliance prior to issuing a finding.</p> <p>The State reported in the FFY 2009 APR that it has changed its procedures for correction of all noncompliance to include a review of new data to verify that EIS programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), in addition to verifying that individual child noncompliance is corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p> <p>For noncompliance the State attempted to verify as corrected prior to issuing findings, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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>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 and FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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>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>

**Missouri 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>
[Compliance Indicator]		
<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 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 and FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to include in the FFY 2009 APR, how many findings of individual noncompliance related to this indicator were issued in FFY 2007, how many findings were issued in FFY 2008 based on the State's FFY 2007 data, and whether those findings were corrected. The State reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2007 or FFY 2008. The State reported that no findings were issued because "the extent of noncompliance did not meet the state's former criteria for identification of systemic noncompliance and individual correction was not required because the children had already exited the Part C system." As stated in OSEP's February 18, 2010 verification letter, and acknowledged in the State's April 18, 2011 letter to OSEP, the State must ensure that all noncompliance, whether systemic or individual, is corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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>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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 92.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008, based on FFY 2007 data. The State reported that no findings were issued, because "the extent of noncompliance did not meet the state's former criteria for identification of systemic noncompliance and individual correction was not required because the children had already exited the Part C system." As stated in OSEP's February 18, 2010 verification letter, and acknowledged in the State's April 18, 2011 letter to OSEP, the State must ensure that all noncompliance, whether systemic or individual, is corrected consistent with OSEP</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.</p>

**Missouri 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>
	Memo 09-02.	<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 §303.148(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>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>
9. General Supervision system (including monitoring complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and	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 2010 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance

**Missouri 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>corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>revisions. 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%. The State reported that all 208 findings of its noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2008. In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of 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.  In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.  In addition, in responding to Indicators 1 and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>

**Missouri 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>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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator, 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 looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012,.</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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, for this indicator 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>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 2009. 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 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. The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the</p>

Missouri 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>
		Indicator 14 Data Rubric.