

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 70.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 74.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 5.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 4.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 10.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 32.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 33%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.4% for reading and 99.3% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.3% for reading and remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 99.3% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 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>
standards. [Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 17.6% for reading and 20.9% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 15.9% for reading and 18.7% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 42.9% for reading and 35.8% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 2.11%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 1.5%.</p> <p>The State reported that four of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that it anticipates the remaining district to come into compliance within 12 months, but that if the district is unable to provide documentation of correction within 12 months, appropriate sanctions will be imposed.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State clarified that it makes an annual determination of whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions/expulsions are occurring and that when it identified significant discrepancies it has reviewed, and if appropriate, revised policies, practices and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's</p>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		<p>examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008)</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised a target for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 927 1419 1308"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>57.4%</td> <td>55.8%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>11.2%</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>10.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>3.7%</td> <td>3.7%</td> <td>3.45%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for Indicator 5A, progress for Indicator 5B, and remain unchanged for Indicator 5C, from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for Indicator 5B, and did not meet its FFY 2006 targets for Indicators 5A and 5C.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.4%	55.8%	60%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.2%	10.6%	10.9%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.7%	3.7%	3.45%	<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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.4%	55.8%	60%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	11.2%	10.6%	10.9%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.7%	3.7%	3.45%															

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																									
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 678 1419 1365"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 678 1060 854">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 678 1178 854">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 678 1295 854">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1295 678 1419 854">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 854 1060 922">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 854 1178 922">1.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 854 1295 922">1.3%</td> <td data-bbox="1295 854 1419 922">.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 922 1060 1057">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 922 1178 1057">1.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 922 1295 1057">1.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1295 922 1419 1057">3.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1057 1060 1159">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1057 1178 1159">28.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1057 1295 1159">53.3%</td> <td data-bbox="1295 1057 1419 1159">36.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1159 1060 1261">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1159 1178 1261">15.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1159 1295 1261">15.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1295 1159 1419 1261">15.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1261 1060 1365">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 1261 1178 1365">53.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1261 1295 1365">28.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1295 1261 1419 1365">43.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.4%	1.3%	.8%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1.9%	1.9%	3.6%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.2%	53.3%	36.9%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	15.0%	15.5%	15.3%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	53.4%	28.0%	43.4%	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” that were required by the instructions for the SPP/APR and a description of how the State will determine outcomes to be comparable to same-aged peers. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.4%	1.3%	.8%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	1.9%	1.9%	3.6%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.2%	53.3%	36.9%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	15.0%	15.5%	15.3%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	53.4%	28.0%	43.4%																							

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 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 parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 69.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 76.49%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 77%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its methodology used to identify districts with disproportionate representation for this indicator in its SPP and provided revised data from 2005-2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.15%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and in FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) A definition of disproportionate representation and a description of how it determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification;</li> <li>(2) Information that it examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation for all race/ethnicity categories in the State and the LEAs to determine if there is disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification;</li> <li>(3) An explanation that it inaccurately used the term "significant disproportionality" in the FFY 2005 APR and that the description of its identification and monitoring process in the SPP refers to the Indicator 9 requirements of</li> </ol>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>disproportionate representation; and</p> <p>(4) Information that it makes an annual determination of whether any district exhibits disproportionate representation based on race or ethnicity using numerical data over more than 1 year.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its methodology used to identify districts with disproportionate representation for this indicator in its SPP and provided revised data from 2005-2006.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.15%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided information showing that it has examined data and made determinations for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for at least the specific disability categories listed in the instructions for Indicator 10. In addition, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided the required information for Indicator 10, which can be found in Analysis/Next Steps for Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173 and 300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 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>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 94%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 94.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that four of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 95.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that four of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 73.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 44.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 99 of 100 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining finding</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to</p>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 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>goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>was corrected by December 3, 2007.</p>	<p>ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator. The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 73.48%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the February 1, 2008 APR its definition of postsecondary education. The State provided this definition.  OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 32.29%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.  The State reported that 1,188 of 1,245 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by December 3, 2007.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.  In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. 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>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**Missouri Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on three hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 46.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 55.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 62.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>