

**Ohio 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 requirements of Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8C, and 9 were the subject of a three-year November 8, 2006 Compliance Agreement. OSEP’s April 30, 2010 letter confirmed ODH’s efforts to ensure compliance under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8C and 9 and indicated that OSEP would respond to the State’s annual data on an annual basis and to the State’s FFY 2009 data under these indicators through this response table.</p>		
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was 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. 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 demonstrate in the FFY 2010 APR that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 was corrected.</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 and the EIS program with the remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008: (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</p>

**Ohio 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>								
		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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.								
<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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 90%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 81%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="569 1295 1512 1497"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="569 1295 940 1393"><b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="940 1295 1129 1393"><b><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1129 1295 1318 1393"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></th> <th data-bbox="1318 1295 1512 1393"><b><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="569 1393 940 1497"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social</td> <td data-bbox="940 1393 1129 1497">63</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1393 1318 1497">60.4</td> <td data-bbox="1318 1393 1512 1497">60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</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	63	60.4	60	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<b><u>Summary Statement 1</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	63	60.4	60							

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	relationships) (%)				
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.9	62.4	60	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	62.5	60.1	60	
	<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) (%)	63.3	62.1	60	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	62.9	62.1	60	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	63.5	61.8	60	
	The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
<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>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	A. Know their rights (%)	94	93	93	-1.00%	
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	94	95	93	1.00%	
	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	92	94	93	2.00%	
	These data represent progress for 4B and 4C and slippage for 4A from the FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets.					
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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>The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator are 1.75%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 1.8%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.4%.</p>					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 3.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 3.3%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 2.9%.</p>					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 of 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it</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 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

**Ohio 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>took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010), and the State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 14, 2010.</p>	<p>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 demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the one remaining uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008 was corrected.</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 and the EIS program with the remaining noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2008: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

**Ohio 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>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 and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four 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 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. 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 §§303.148(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</p>

**Ohio 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. In the FFY 2010 APR, 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>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 87%. 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 explained that it verified correction of the noncompliance, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, prior to issuing findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2009 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p> <p>The State was also identified as being in need of assistance based on its FFY 2006 APR. In addition to reporting with the FFY 2008 APR on its use of technical assistance, the State was also required to report to OSEP by October 1, 2010 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance. The State submitted the required information on October 14, 2010.</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 LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(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 §303.148(b)(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 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</p>

**Ohio 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>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>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 and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 24 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 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>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</p>

**Ohio 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>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 and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99%. The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 99 of 105 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that three findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR, were corrected.</p> <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p>

**Ohio 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>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report 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 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.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</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 provided targets and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and revised improvement activities for FFY 2010, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 25%. These data are based on four complaints. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution</p>

**Ohio 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>
		requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [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). [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [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.</p> <p>The State reported that the one mediation resulted in a mediation agreement.</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. [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 represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 93%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>