

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 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 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 98.73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.49%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was 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.</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 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</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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>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>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 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's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 95.80%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 96.20%.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to provide a revised SPP that reflected the revision to the measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR. The revised SPP does not reflect those revisions. Further, the State revised the indicator language so that it is not consistent with the required indicator language.</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments are at or greater than 95%. There is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and assumes that the State is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance with 34 CFR §§303.12, 303.18, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii).</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The State did not provide data for this Indicator and the State must provide the required data based</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<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>FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State did not provide any FFY 2009 data for this indicator. Rather, the State submitted the same FFY 2008 baseline data that it submitted in its SPP in 2010. Because the State reported no FFY 2009 data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its targets.</p>	<p>on the required measurement table for this Indicator for FFY 2009 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>																				
<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;</p> <p>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and</p> <p>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 revised the targets and improvements activities for FFY 2010, and OSEPs accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and the revised targets for FFY 2010. 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="550 841 1581 1218"> <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>A. Know their rights (%)</td> <td align="center">74</td> <td align="center">85</td> <td align="center">90</td> <td align="center">11.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)</td> <td align="center">87</td> <td align="center">95</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">8.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</td> <td align="center">91</td> <td align="center">92</td> <td align="center">94</td> <td align="center">1.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 4B and did not meet its targets for 4A and 4C.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2008 SPP/APR response table, dated June 3, 2010, required the State to report, in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, whether its FFY 2009 data are based on a response group that is representative of its population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State reported that the FFY 2009 data are based on a response group that is representative of its population.</p>		<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. Know their rights (%)	74	85	90	11.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	87	95	94	8.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	91	92	94	1.00%	<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>
	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. Know their rights (%)	74	85	90	11.00%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	87	95	94	8.00%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	91	92	94	1.00%																		

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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, revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, 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, and the revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010. 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 .98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of .86%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 1.16%.</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, a revised SPP that reflected the revisions to the indicator language with its FFY 2009 APR. The State provided the revisions to the indicator language in its revised FFY 2009 SPP.</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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010, 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, and the revised targets for FFY 2009 and FFY 2010. The revised FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 targets are less rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 2.78%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 2.72%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 2.84%.</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, a revised SPP that reflected the revisions to the measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR. The State provided the revisions to the measurement language in its FFY 2009 SPP.</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>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 OSEP accepts those revisions. The State did not report that improvement activities will cover the remaining years of the SPP. The State must revise its SPP to make clear that improvement activities will be conducted through FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.21%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.10%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for</p>	<p>With the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must submit a revised SPP that includes improvement activities through FFY 2012.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR,</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>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 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 §§303.321(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</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 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 99.06%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96.45%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</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>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</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 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.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 94.69%. The State's reported FFY 2008 data were 95.46%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State 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>The State must demonstrate, in</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance finding identified in FFY 2007 was 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> <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 remaining FFY 2007 noncompliance: (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 other reasons), consistent with OSEP</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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>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 96.43%. The State's reported FFY 2008 data were 96.87%.The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 20 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that five of six findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 was 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</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2010 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</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 remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (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>
9. General Supervision system	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities	The State must demonstrate, in

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>(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>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 86.11%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 63 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported in the revised FFY 2009 APR on the Indicator 9 Worksheet that all 63 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not report under this indicator, as required by OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02) and the FFY 2008 response table, that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program.</p> <p>The State reported that 31 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that two findings were subsequently corrected in May 2009. The State reported on the actions it took to address the continuing noncompliance. OSEP cannot determine the remaining number of uncorrected findings for FFY 2007. On page 67 of the revised FFY 2009 APR for this indicator, the State reported “The three remaining findings of noncompliance around Indicator 8 were for the County C.” The State reported in Indicators 8A-both findings corrected; 8B-one of two findings corrected; and 8C- five of six findings corrected.</p>	<p>the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the correction of the one remaining finding of noncompliance for Indicator 8B and one remaining finding of noncompliance for Indicator 8C, both identified in FFY 2007.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008.</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 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.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9</p>

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		Worksheet. 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.
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]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one complaint. The State reported that it did not have any signed written complaints during the FFY 2008 reporting period. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State efforts in achieving compliance with the timely resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
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]	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period. 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.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.

Wisconsin Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 90%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 93.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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 it is in 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, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>