Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<ol> <li>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</li> <li>[Compliance Indicator]</li> </ol>	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data are not valid and reliable because they do not reflect the measurement for this indicator (i.e., timely initiation of EI services on initial IFSPs and any new additional EI services on subsequent IFSPs). Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage. However, based on the State's FFY 2006 data that measured the timely provision of EI services on initial IFSPs, OSEP was able to determine that the State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was corrected by October 15, 2007.	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided a plan to collect and report data that reflect the measurement for this indicator beginning in FFY 2007. However, the State reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 because it restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities. The State reported that it monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance. The State reported that the noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) was corrected as of October 15, 2007. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide valid and reliable data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that reflect the measurement for this indicator and demonstrate that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<ul><li>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</li><li>[Results Indicator]</li></ul>	The State revised the targets for this indicator (by removing its birth to one targets) in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 76%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 75.68%.	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported data demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii) that all IFSPs include a statement regarding the natural environments in which early intervention services will be

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
					<ul><li>provided and a justification when services are not provided in that environment.</li><li>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure compliance with these requirements and also its efforts to improve performance.</li></ul>
3. Percent of infants and toddlers	The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:			The State reported the required progress data	
<ul><li>with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</li><li>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</li><li>B. Acquisition and use of</li></ul>	06-07 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	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
knowledge and skills (including	a. % of infant & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	2.38%	4.76%	4.76%	
<ul><li>early language/ communication);</li><li>and</li><li>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>b. % of infant &amp; toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</li> </ul>	7.14%	9.52%	2.38%	
[Results Indicator; New]	c. % of infant & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	30.95%	35.71%	28.57%	
	d. % of infant & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	40.48%	35.71%	35.71%	
	e. % of infant & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	19.05%	14.29%	28.57%	
	The State provided improvement activities remaining years of the SPP.	for this inc	licator cov	vering the	
4. Percent of families participating	The State's reported data for this indicator are:		OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to		
in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006	improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due
A. Know their rights;	A. Know their rights.	Data 90%	Data 95%	Target 90%	February 1, 2009.
B. Effectively communicate their	B. Effectively communicate their	95%	90%	95%	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State

FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps		
children's needs; and	children's needs.				reported that its data for this indicator are	
C. Help their children develop and learn.	C. Help their children develop and learn.	95%	94%	95%	representative of the population served in FFY 2006. However, the State did not indicate what variables it considered in	
[Results Indicator]	These data represent progress for 4A and si FFY 2005 data.	lippage for	4B and 4	C from the	determining representativeness. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State	
	The State met its FFY 2006 target for 4A a and 4C.	nd did not	meet its ta	rgets for 4B	must address whether its FFY 2007 data are representative, including the variables that the State considered in making a determination of representativeness.	
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:	The State revised the improvement activitie OSEP accepts those revisions.	es for this i	ndicator i	n its SPP and	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance	
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data		are .71%.	These data	in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.	
B. National data.	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target	of .80%.				
[Results Indicator]						
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:	The State revised the improvement activitie OSEP accepts those revisions.	es for this i	ndicator i	n its SPP and	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance	
A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data		are 1.68%	. These data	in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.	
B. National data.	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target	of 2.0%.				
[Results Indicator]						
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an	The State revised the improvement activitie OSEP accepts those revisions	es for this i	ndicator i	n its SPP and	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State	
evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this represent progress from the FFY 2005 data		are 90%.	These data	reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 because it	
[Compliance Indicator]	The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target	of 100%.			restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the	
	The State reported that one of three finding FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corr second finding was corrected by October 1 noncompliance, the State reported that it as	ected in a 5, 2007. F	timely ma	nner and that orrected	findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities. The State reported that it monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance.	
	to the region and is providing monthly tech				The State reported that the noncompliance it	
					· · · ·	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	correction of the noncompliance.	identified in FFY 2005 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.
		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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342, including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<ul> <li>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:</li> <li>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</li> <li>[Compliance Indicator]</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</li> <li>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress because the State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator.</li> <li>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</li> <li>The State reported that one of two findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was corrected by October 15, 2007.</li> </ul>	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided FFY 2006 data collected from record reviews. However, the State reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 because it restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities. The State reported that it monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance.
		The State reported that the noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) was corrected as of October 15, 2007.
EEV 2006 SDD/ADD Despense Table		OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).
<ul> <li>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:</li> <li>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</li> </ul>	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However OSEP recalculated the data to be 99.77%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 81%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that one of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by October 15, 2007.	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State clarified that it has not adopted an opt-out policy under OSEP's 2004 <i>Letter to Elder</i> . The State reported that its FFY 2006 data are not based on parental consent for LEA notification and that as of December 2007, LEA notification occurs through an automated process in the State's data system. However, the State reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 because it restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities. The State reported that it monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance. The State reported that the noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) was corrected as of October 15, 2007. 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 requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 88%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State reported that one of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it required monthly on-site technical assistance, restructured personnel, and assigned a new district administrator in one regional office.	reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 because it restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities. The State reported that it monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance. The State reported that the noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected. 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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>[Compliance Indicator]</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</li> <li>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 40%.</li> <li>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 48%.</li> <li>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</li> <li>The State reported that 6 of 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner, and 11 of 15 findings were corrected by October 15, 2007. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it required monthly on-site technical assistance, restructured personnel,</li> </ul>	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported that it could not provide correction data for the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. The State reported that it restructured its 55 EIS programs (where the findings were made) into nine regional points of entry (POE), which are new entities, in part to ensure that noncompliance is identified and timely corrected. The State reported that it

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	and assigned new district administrators in seven of its regional offices.	monitored all POEs in FFY 2005 to identify any noncompliance.
		The State reported that 11 of 15 findings of noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 were corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 9 from FFY 2005.
		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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501.
		In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>[Compliance Indicator]</li> </ul>	The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on five complaints, and remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §§303.510 through 303.512.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.	The State received two due process hearing requests in FFY 2006. Both requests were resolved without a hearing.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
[Compliance Indicator]		

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<ul><li>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).</li><li>[Results Indicator]</li></ul>	The State reported that no resolutions sessions were held during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
<ul><li>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</li><li>[Results Indicator]</li></ul>	The State reported that the one mediation held resulted in a mediation agreement. The State reported fewer than 10 mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
<ul><li>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</li><li>[Compliance Indicator]</li></ul>	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.	In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided data in the FFY 2006 APR that included a percentage and addressed the extent to which the State's 618 and SPP/APR data for the reporting period were timely and accurate. 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, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.