

Alaska Part C FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator are 84%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 85%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State revised its SPP to clarify its timely standard for this indicator. OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>On page 24 of the APR, the State reported that one local program with findings in FFY 2004 reported full compliance prior to the completion of FFY 2004 and that the other program also demonstrated full compliance within one year of identification, in FFY 2005.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) any necessary revisions to its improvement strategies to address the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1); (2) data demonstrating compliance with those requirements; (3) clarification of its timely standard; and (4) its final progress report which was due November 3, 2006. As indicated, the State revised its timely standard. In addition, while the FFY 2005 data reported in the February 1, 2007 APR do not show compliance, the State reported that prior noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 relating to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator are 94.5%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 94.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2006-2010 targets for this indicator in its SPP to 95% and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that it is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams make individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure compliance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	Entry data provided.	The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Baseline, targets, and improvement activities provided. The State reported baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4A. 94.3% 4B. 97.5% 4C. 98.0% 	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that the response rate from the statewide parent questionnaire was 25% and the results were representative of the families in Alaska. In the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must continue to include data and information that describe the extent to which the responses are representative of the State's Part C population.</p>
5. Percent of infants and toddlers	The State's FFY 2005 APR	The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 0.9%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 0.9%.</p>	<p>performance.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers 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>The State's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 2.1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 2.1%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator are 88%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 71%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 4 of 5 findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 7 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>On page 24 of the APR, the State reported that the program, which had not corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, demonstrated progress during the one-year monitoring period from 58% to 80% (8 of 10 records reviewed met the 45-day timeline standard). The State reported that to ensure full compliance in FFY 2006, it had imposed Special Conditions on the program's grant award.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) any necessary revisions to its improvement strategies to address the requirements related to this indicator; (2) data that demonstrate compliance with those requirements; and (3) correction data on two local programs. The State reported correction data with its February 1, 2007 APR showing that: (1) as of June 30, 2006, one local program (ACC) had 95% compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements and 100% compliance as of September 30, 2006; and (2) the other program (TCC) had 100% compliance as of September 30, 2005 and September 30, 2006. OSEP appreciates the State's correction of this FFY 2003 data. However, the State's FFY 2005 data, while indicating progress, continue to show noncompliance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</p>
<p>8A. 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's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator are 94%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the APR, the State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004, in which the IFSP of a 31month-old child did not have a transition plan, was corrected prior to the child's third birthday.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter reported that it looked forward to data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrated full compliance with the requirements related to this indicator and required the State to submit in that APR, statewide data and specific data for one local program. In the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported specific data for one local program (TCC) demonstrating that by June 30, 2006, the program had 90% compliance with transition plan requirements and 100% compliance as of September 30, 2006. OSEP appreciates the State's correction of this FFY 2003 data.</p> <p>The State did not submit the raw data for this indicator. The State must provide raw data when reporting under this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements at 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>8B. 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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 86%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>On page 24 of the APR, the State reported that the local program that had one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 had achieved 100% compliance on Indicators 8B and 8C within one year of monitoring.</p> <p>OSEP reported in its March 30, 2006 SPP response letter that it looked forward to data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrated full compliance with the requirements related to this indicator. The data in the February 1, 2007 APR</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that prior noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>show noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not submit the raw data for this indicator. The State must provide raw data when reporting under this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include the data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>8C. 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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 85%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 under this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>In the APR, the State reported that the local program that had one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 had achieved 100% compliance on Indicators 8B and 8C within one year of monitoring.</p> <p>OSEP reported in its March 30, 2006 SPP response letter that it looked forward to data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrated full compliance with the requirements related to this indicator and required the State to submit in that APR, statewide data and specific data for one local program (TCC). In the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported specific data for TCC (identified with noncompliance in FFY 2003) showing that as of June 30, 2006, the program had a 75% compliance level (6 of 8 children had timely transition conferences or delays were caused by documented family circumstances). The State reported that it had imposed sanctions on, and taken enforcement action against, the program. In its FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must report on the correction of the noncompliance previously identified in this local program.</p> <p>The State did not submit the raw data for this indicator and OSEP was unable to determine whether the State included as part of its calculation for compliance under this indicator, the number of documented delays attributable to family circumstances. The State must provide raw data when reporting under this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR. If the State collects data on delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances and wishes to include this data in the FFY 2006 APR, the number of children for whom the timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and denominator of the measurement for this indicator in the FFY</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2006 APR.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) as modified by section 637(a) (9) of the IDEA, including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93.8%. This represents progress from the revised FFY 2004 data of 88%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2004 baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR documentation that the State ensured the correction of identified noncompliance, as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification and specific data for two local programs. In the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 under Indicators 1, 2, and 8 was corrected within one year of identification and four of five programs with noncompliance related to Indicator 7 timely corrected their noncompliance. The State also reported correction data on noncompliance identified in FFY 2003 for two local programs (ACC and TCC) showing that: (1) both programs had corrected noncompliance identified under Indicator 7 by September 30, 2006; and (2) one program (TCC) had corrected noncompliance related to Indicator 8A as of September 30, 2006, but had not corrected the noncompliance related to Indicator 8C.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642 and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to Indicator 7 and specific data on the correction of FFY 2003 noncompliance related to Indicator 8C for one local program (TCC). In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C, specifically</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.
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]	The State reported that it did not receive any written complaints in FFY 2005.	The State did not receive any written complaints in FFY 2005.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings in FFY 2005.	The State did not receive any requests for due process hearings in FFY 2005.
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). [Results Indicator; New]	Not applicable.	The State has adopted the Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that it did not conduct any mediations in the FFY 2005 reporting period.	The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p> <p>The State met its revised FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>As requested in OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter, the State revised its targets in the SPP on March 27, 2007 to specifically indicate 100% timeliness and 100% accuracy regarding data reported to OSEP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642 and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>