

**California Part C FFY 2010 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 IDEA Part C regulations cited in this APR Response Table as 34 CFR §303.xxx are those regulations which were in effect during FFY 2010. If the State has chosen to implement any of the new regulations published in 76 Federal Register 60140 (September 28, 2011) prior to the required implementation date of July 1, 2012 for a regulation that impacts the measurements for an SPP/ APR indicator, the State must so indicate in its FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 92.2%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by the California Department of Education (CDE). OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and OSEP’s February 15, 2011 Verification Letter required the State to provide data under this indicator that include children served under Part C by CDE, and the State did not provide these data. The State reported that FFY 2010 data for this indicator do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by the CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that it continues to work with CDE toward the goal of providing valid and reliable data on all children served.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and OSEP’s February 15, 2011 Verification Visit Letter required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, documentation that it has reviewed the SPP/APR Indicator 1 data in its database regarding the timeliness of providing EIS at least once each year, and has made a finding of noncompliance if the data for a Regional Center showed less than 100% compliance (unless such noncompliance was corrected before such finding is issued). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State reported that it collected the FFY 2010 data for this indicator through on-site monitoring visits to programs selected for review based on the State’s multi-year monitoring plan. The State reported in the FFY 2010 APR that, beginning in FFY 2010, it was no longer using data from its Purchase of Service claims data provided by regional centers to the State because that methodology resulted in the over-reporting of noncompliance as it failed to capture services delayed due to documented exceptional family circumstances and services provided through contracts between regional centers and providers.</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The State must also report, in the FFY 2011 APR, on why it did not make findings based on the FFY 2009 data that the State reported under this indicator, given that the FFY 2009 data reflected noncompliance.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 85%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 87.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 90%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</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</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1344 1581 1511"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1344 957 1446"><u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1344 1163 1446"><u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1344 1371 1446"><u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u></th> <th data-bbox="1371 1344 1581 1446"><u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1446 957 1511"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills</td> <td data-bbox="957 1446 1163 1511">46.9</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1446 1371 1511">42.19</td> <td data-bbox="1371 1446 1581 1511">39.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills	46.9	42.19	39.8	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating</p>
<u><b>Summary Statement 1</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2009 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Data</b></u>	<u><b>FFY 2010 Target</b></u>							
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills	46.9	42.19	39.8							

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p>	(including social relationships) (%)				<p>improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.  The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	43.9	41.81	43.4		
<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	41.4	37.44	34.02		
<p align="center"><b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b></p>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>		
<p><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</p>	72.5	62.28	77		
<p><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</p>	64.2	46.14	69		
<p><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</p>	67.8	57.55	72		
<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are not valid and reliable because the State reported that its data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its targets. The State reported that future efforts will focus on obtaining data on children with low-incidence disabilities served through CDE.</p>					
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:  A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>A. Know their rights (%)</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b></p> <p align="center">79.6</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b></p> <p align="center">83</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b></p> <p align="center">50.5</p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Progress</u></b></p> <p align="center">3.40%</p>	

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.  [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</p>	<p>88.6</p>	<p>87.5</p>	<p>44.5</p>	<p>-1.10%</p>	
	<p>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</p>	<p>90.5</p>	<p>91.2</p>	<p>73.5</p>	<p>0.70%</p>	
	<p>These data represent progress for 4A and 4C, and slippage for 4B, from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>					
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.  [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.65%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0.98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0.96%.</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.  [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 2.04%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 of 2.29%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 2.00%.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 76.56%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and February 15, 2011 Verification Letter required the State to provide data under this indicator that include children served by CDE and the State did not provide these data. The State reported that the FFY 2010 data for this indicator do not include data for “low incidence disability” children receiving Part C services through CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that it continues to work with CDE toward the goal of providing valid and reliable data on all children served.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and both findings identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>					<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 80%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and February 15, 2011 Verification Letter required the State to provide data under this indicator that include children served by CDE and the State did not provide these data. The State reported that the FFY 2010 data for this indicator do</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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:                      A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;                      [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>not include data for “low incidence disability” children receiving Part C services through CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that it continues to work with CDE toward the goal of providing valid and reliable data on all children served.</p> <p>The State reported that both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>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) and (d)(8). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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) and (d)(8) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.97%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and February 15, 2011 Verification Letter required the State to provide data under this indicator that include children served by CDE and the State did not provide these data. The State reported that the FFY 2010 data for this indicator do not include data for “low incidence disability” children receiving Part C services through CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that it continues to work with CDE toward the goal of providing valid and reliable data on all children served.</p> <p>The State reported that three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.81%. However, the State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the data do not include children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, and February 15, 2011 Verification Letter required the State to provide data under this indicator that include children served by CDE and the State did not provide these data. The State reported that the FFY 2010 data for this indicator do not include data for “low incidence disability” children receiving Part C services through CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target. The State reported that it continues to work with CDE toward the goal of providing valid and reliable data on all children served.</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, the State reported under Indicator 14 that it did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because as the State acknowledged under this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR that its data under this indicator do not include information regarding findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 related</p>	<p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data for FFY 2010 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>to services for children with solely low-incidence disabilities being served through Part C by CDE. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>The State also reported that 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and 18 findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must include in its FFY 2011 data for this indicator data on the timely correction of any findings of noncompliance identified by CDE during FFY 2010. In addition, if there were any findings identified by CDE in FFY 2009, the State must report on the number of findings and the status of correction of those findings.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2011 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 91.67%. These data are based on the State's reporting the timely resolution of 11 of 12 complaints. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 26.67%. These data are based on the State's reporting the timely adjudication of four out of 15 due process hearing requests. These data represent progress for the FFY 2009 data of 18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</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 2011 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §303.420(b)</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing</p>

**California Part C FFY 2010 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>resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>82.14%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 55%.  Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 83.4%. However, OSEP recalculated these data to be 85.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 94.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, 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.  If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>