

**Wyoming 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. [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 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1).</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.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 100%. 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 (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="653 1162 1495 1497"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="653 1162 984 1295"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="984 1162 1152 1295"><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1152 1162 1323 1295"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1323 1162 1495 1295"><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="653 1295 984 1430"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="984 1295 1152 1430">42.55</td> <td data-bbox="1152 1295 1323 1430">44.82</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1295 1495 1430">42.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="653 1430 984 1497"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of</td> <td data-bbox="984 1430 1152 1497">47.17</td> <td data-bbox="1152 1430 1323 1497">48.55</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1430 1495 1497">47.17</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) (%)	42.55	44.82	42.55	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	47.17	48.55	47.17	<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 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>											
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	42.55	44.82	42.55											
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of	47.17	48.55	47.17											

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps					
	knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)									
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.34	54.70	54.34						
	<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) (%)	50.48	47.86	50.48						
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	53	45.66	53						
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	54.16	51.25	54.16						
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its targets for FFY 2009 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;</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 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="653 1425 1499 1507"> <tr> <td data-bbox="653 1425 1003 1507"></td> <td data-bbox="1003 1425 1121 1507"><u>FFY 2008</u></td> <td data-bbox="1121 1425 1247 1507"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> <td data-bbox="1247 1425 1381 1507"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> <td data-bbox="1381 1425 1499 1507"><u>Progress</u></td> </tr> </table>					<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>Progress</u>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>Progress</u>						

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

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>		
	A. Know their rights (%)	97.7	96.97	94.5	-0.73%	
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	96.7	96.27	94.5	-0.43%	
	C. Help their children develop and learn (%)	97.2	95.58	94.1	-1.62%	
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.					
<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 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 1.83%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator were 1.87%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 1.03%.</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. [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 4.46%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 4.59%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 2.67%.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [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 99.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.7%. 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</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 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</p>

**Wyoming 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>manner. However, the State reported that it used a standard of 95% for correction for FFY 2008-2009 when making findings for this indicator. OSEP's February 2, 2011 verification letter found that the State's 95% threshold was inconsistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02), requirement that the State verify correction of noncompliance by ensuring that the EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's verification letter required an assurance within 90 days from that letter, and the State submitted the required assurance on April 26, 2011. The State also included an assurance in the APR that it will correctly implement 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) using a threshold of 100% compliance and based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and 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. It is still unclear whether the State's correction data under this indicator met the appropriate standard.</p> <p>OSEP's February 2, 2011 verification letter required the State to provide within 90 days of that letter its plan on ensuring how NICU referrals are included in its data under this Indicator. On April 26, 2011, the State submitted its plan and OSEP accepts that plan.</p>	<p>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 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>With the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the process it used to ensure that NICU referrals are included in the measurement for Indicator 7 or included in the numbers of children excluded due to exceptional family circumstances in the SPP/APR, and that, for each referral, regional EIS programs assign a service</p>

**Wyoming 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>coordinator, conduct the initial evaluation and assessments, document eligibility on infants that meet the criteria of established conditions, and conduct and initial IFSP meeting (if the child is eligible).</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:                      A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;                      [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 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 97.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that its one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. However, the State reported that it used a standard of 95% for correction for FFY 2008-2009 when making findings for this indicator. OSEP’s February 2, 2011 verification letter found that the State’s 95% threshold was inconsistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02 requirement that the State verify correction of noncompliance by ensuring that the EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s verification letter required an assurance within 90 days from that letter, and the State submitted the required assurance on April 26, 2011. The State also included an assurance in the APR that it will correctly implement 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) using a threshold of 100% compliance and based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and has developed the transition plan with steps and services, although late, for any child for whom the plan was not held, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. It is still unclear whether the State’s correction data under this indicator met the appropriate standard.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State 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 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</p>

**Wyoming 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 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 100%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State had reported 90.33% compliance for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR. The State is revising the data reported under this indicator from 90.33% to 100% as they held an incorrect standard for measuring compliance with this requirement. The lead agency is the LEA and therefore all the EI programs had notified the LEA through the use of the Statewide data base. The State reported all 40 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that it did not have any individual files out of compliance.</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.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 90.82%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 38 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. However, the State reported that it used a standard of 95% for correction for FFY 2008-2009 when making findings for this indicator. OSEP’s February 2, 2011 verification letter found that the State’s 95% threshold was inconsistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02 requirement that the State verify correction of noncompliance by ensuring that the EIS program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it</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.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified</p>

**Wyoming 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>corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's verification letter required an assurance within 90 days from that letter, and the State submitted the required assurance on April 26, 2011. The State also included an assurance in the APR that it will correctly implement 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) using a threshold of 100% compliance and based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State data system; and has conducted the timely transition conference, although late, for any child for whom the 90-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. It is still unclear whether the State's correction data under this indicator met the appropriate standard.</p>	<p>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>
<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 100%. The State reported that all of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>However, the State reported that it used a standard of 95% for correction for FFY 2008-2009 when making findings for this indicator. OSEP's February 2, 2011 verification letter found that the following State practices were inconsistent with the IDEA and OSEP Memo 09-02: OSEP found that the State does not require correction for any noncompliance that results from a level of compliance that is below the 95% threshold. The State is not verifying correction of noncompliance because it is not ensuring that the EIS program is correctly</p>	<p>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</p>

**Wyoming 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>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. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance reported under this indicator. OSEP's February 2, 2011 verification letter required an assurance within 90 days from that letter, and the State submitted the required assurance on April 26, 2011.</p>	<p>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 reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 7, 8A and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>With its FFY 2010 APR, the State must include a description of how it changed its process for issuing written findings of noncompliance and how it changed the process for tracking correction of noncompliance and revised its monitoring manual. In addition, the State must include copies of two monitoring reports, notification letters, two CAP tracking logs and two letters detailing release from the CAP.</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.</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 signed written complaints during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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.</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 2011 AP, due February 1, 2012.</p>

**Wyoming 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>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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and 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 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 or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 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 demonstrate progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.5%. 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>