

**Michigan Part C 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 infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data and 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 47.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 19%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted focused monitoring and implemented improvement plans that include quarterly reporting requirements.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State clarified which set of data in its FFY 2005 APR is the State's FFY 2005 baseline data. The State reported that it is unable to document the correction of FFY 2004 noncompliance related to this indicator because the necessary data were not collected in the correct timeframes under its previous monitoring system. However, the State monitored 19 service areas for noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2005. In addition, the State reported that it will begin reporting on correction of noncompliance under its redesigned general supervision system with its FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>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 not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating 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.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Michigan Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 88.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 88%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data demonstrating compliance with the requirement in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii) that IFSPs include a justification when early intervention services are not provided in the natural environment. It is unclear whether the data provided by the State demonstrate compliance with these requirements because it is unclear why the State excluded from its calculation 34 files that did not identify service location as 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1) requires, in part, that IFSPs list the location of the services and a justification for any of those services that are not provided in the natural environment. The State must provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii).</p>																				
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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</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="548 938 1419 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 938 1062 1114">06-07 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 938 1180 1114">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1180 938 1297 1114">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 938 1419 1114">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1114 1062 1182">a. % of infant &amp; toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1114 1180 1182">1.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1114 1297 1182">3.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1114 1419 1182">3.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1182 1062 1317">b. % of infant &amp; toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age dpeers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1182 1180 1317">10.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1182 1297 1317">13.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1182 1419 1317">8.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1317 1062 1417">c. % of infant &amp; toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1317 1180 1417">28.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1317 1297 1417">28.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1317 1419 1417">33.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1417 1062 1516">d. % of infant &amp; toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1417 1180 1516">25.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1180 1417 1297 1516">33.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1417 1419 1516">23.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infant & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	1.7%	3.4%	3.4%	b. % of infant & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age dpeers.	10.2%	13.6%	8.5%	c. % of infant & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.8%	28.8%	33.9%	d. % of infant & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.4%	33.9%	23.7%	<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 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																			
a. % of infant & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	1.7%	3.4%	3.4%																			
b. % of infant & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-age dpeers.	10.2%	13.6%	8.5%																			
c. % of infant & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	28.8%	28.8%	33.9%																			
d. % of infant & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	25.4%	33.9%	23.7%																			

**Michigan Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	e. % of infant & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	33.9%	20.3%	30.5%																	
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 537 1419 854"> <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. Know their rights.</td> <td>56%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs.</td> <td>51%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn.</td> <td>73%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data, and the State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p> <p>The State did not provide the actual numbers used in its calculations.</p>					FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Know their rights.	56%	58%	56%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs.	51%	54%	51%	C. Help their children develop and learn.	73%	75%	73%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State included a copy of the parent surveys that it is using to report under this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population, and indicated that a number of strategies are being utilized to address the issue of under representation of minorities in survey results. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must continue to address the representativeness of its response group. In addition, the State must provide the actual numbers used in the calculations for this indicator.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																		
A. Know their rights.	56%	58%	56%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs.	51%	54%	51%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn.	73%	75%	73%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</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 1.08%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.03%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 1.2%.</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>In response to OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State clarified that the proposed changes to its eligibility criteria were made available for public participation under Part C requirements in November 2007. The State must submit any changes to its eligibility criteria to OSEP for approval, prior to implementation.</p>																
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>																

**Michigan Part C 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>birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 2.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 2.3%.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>[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 63.1%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage from the State's FFY 2005 data because that data did not reflect the correct reporting period.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of 18 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted focused monitoring and implemented improvement plans that include quarterly reporting requirements.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported that it monitored 19 service areas for compliance with the requirement in 34 CFR §§303.322(c)(3)(ii) and 303.344(a) that each child have a timely, comprehensive, multidisciplinary evaluation and an IFSP that identifies the child's present level of functioning in each of the five developmental areas and found that 37% of the records reviewed met these requirements. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must provide data demonstrating that it is in compliance with these requirements.</p> <p>Also, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State provided its revised definition of initial IFSP meeting that is consistent with the requirements articulated in OSEP's October 10, 2007 memorandum to the State on this subject. The State reported that it made its proposed definition of initial IFSP meeting available for public participation in November 2007. The State must submit any further changes to its definition to OSEP for approval, prior to implementation.</p> <p>The State reported that it is unable to document the correction of FFY 2004 noncompliance because the necessary data were not collected in the correct timeframes under its previous monitoring system.</p>

**Michigan Part C FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>However, the State monitored 19 service areas for noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2005. In addition, the State reported that it will begin reporting on correction of noncompliance under its redesigned general supervision system with its FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance it 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.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 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.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State 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 73.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 59.28%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that three of eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted focused monitoring and implemented improvement plans that include quarterly reporting requirements.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported that it is unable to document the correction of FFY 2004 noncompliance because the necessary data were not collected in the correct timeframes under its previous monitoring system. However, the State monitored 19 service areas for noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2005. In addition, the State reported that it will begin reporting on correction of noncompliance under its redesigned general supervision system with its FFY 2007 APR.</p>

**Michigan Part C 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>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 partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 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 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</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>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 85.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 84.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that two of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted focused monitoring and implemented improvement plans that include</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table, the State reported that it is unable to document the correction of FFY 2004 noncompliance because the necessary data were not collected in the correct timeframes under its previous monitoring system. However, the State monitored 19 service areas for noncompliance related to this indicator in FFY 2005. In addition, the State reported that it will begin</p>

**Michigan Part C 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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>quarterly reporting requirements.</p>	<p>reporting on correction of noncompliance under its redesigned general supervision system with its FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 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.</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 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 28%. The State reported that 14 of 50 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2005 data did not reflect the measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it conducted focused monitoring and implemented improvement plans that include quarterly reporting requirements.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. As noted above in Indicators 1, 7, 8A and 8C, the State is unable to document correction of that noncompliance. The State reported that it has continued to examine all of its 57 service areas through self-assessments, on-site record reviews, data verification, and the State's data system and that it monitored 19 service areas to identify noncompliance with APR indicators in FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has</p>

**Michigan Part C 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>corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 9 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>OSEP's March 24, 2008 verification letter concluded that OSEP was not yet able to determine whether the Service Provider Self Review (SPSR) and the Data Verification components of the Continuous Improvement Monitoring System (CIMS) under the State's redesigned general supervision system are reasonably designed to identify and correct noncompliance because the State reported that it would not begin reporting correction data under the SPSR until the FFY 2007 APR reporting period and would not develop or implement the Data Verification process until later in 2008.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 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.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified 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. [Compliance Indicator]</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 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>



**Michigan Part C 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 fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 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 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with Part C's data reporting requirements under IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p>