

Arkansas 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 reported data for this indicator are 94.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP is not able to determine progress or slippage. The State did not provide baseline data in the FFY 2004 APR.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine if the State corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In Indicator 9, the State reported that findings were made related to timely services, but did not indicate if those findings were corrected.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP’s March 23, 2006, SPP response letter, the State provided its definition of “timely,” specifically “thirty (30) calendar days from the date the initial IFSP or 30 days from when the parent consents to additional services on subsequent IFSP’s.” OSEP assumes that the reference to “date the initial IFSP” is when the parents consent to the services on the initial IFSP.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, 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 2004 and 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 reported data for this indicator are 62.95%. This represents progress from the State’s revised FFY 2004 data of 62.43%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 77.2%.</p>	<p>Based on comments in OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter, the State revised the baseline data and improvement activities for this indicator. The State also revised its targets for this indicator for FFY 2006-2010. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due on February 1, 2008, the State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>It is important that the State also monitor 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.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>	<p>Entry data for FFY 2005 provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<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>The State's FFY 2005 APR reported data for this indicator are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4A. 71.73% 4B. 60.62% 4C. 79.41% 	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p>
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 actual target data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are .39%. This</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for FFYs 2006-2010, and the improvement activities, for this indicator in its revised SPP (submitted on May 16, 2007). The State reported slippage and OSEP looks forward to the State's data</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>represents slippage from FFY 2004 baseline of .83%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of .83%.</p>	<p>demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 2.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 2.95%.</p> <p>This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 2.94%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for FFYs 2006-2010, and the improvement activities, for this indicator in its revised SPP (submitted on May 16, 2007). OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State reported slippage. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</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 reported data for this indicator are 75.80%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 55%.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine if the State corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In Indicator 9, the State reported that findings were made related to the IFSP 45-day timeline, but did not indicate if those findings were corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a). The State's FFY 2005 data represent progress toward achieving compliance.</p> <p>The State reported a large number of delays due to family reasons. It is important that the State monitor to ensure that family delays are based on documented exceptional family circumstances.</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 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 reported data for this indicator are 54%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>This represents progress from the State’s FFY 2004 revised baseline of 38.83%.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine if the State corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In Indicator 9, the State reported that findings were made related to transition, but did not indicate if those findings were related to 8A or if they were corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline data and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the State applied the appropriate measurement to calculate its FFY 2004 revised baseline and FFY 2005 data to respond to Indicator 8A. On page 16 of the APR, the State indicated, “there were 1016 transition steps recorded and this was divided by 1876 infants and toddlers exiting Part C.” The APR measurement required that the State provide “the number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by the number of children exiting Part C times 100.” In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must confirm whether it applied the correct measurement for its FFY 2004 revised baseline and FFY 2005 data. In addition, in the FFY 2006 APR, the State must apply (and confirm that it applied) the correct measurement in determining its FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). The data in the FFY 2005 APR show noncompliance.</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 §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and 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 79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 revised baseline of 96.21%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). The data in the FFY 2005 APR show noncompliance.</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>OSEP is unable to determine if the State corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In Indicator 9, the State reported that findings were made related to transition, but did not indicate if those findings were related to 8B or if they were corrected.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure that the State will be able to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and 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 87%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made due to issues regarding the State’s baseline data.</p> <p>OSEP is unable to determine if the State corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. In Indicator 9, the State reported that findings were made related to transition, but did not indicate if those findings were related to 8C or if they were corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State submitted a revised baseline of 102% on page 19 of the revised SPP. However, the State reported “the data on the conferences was skewed due to transition conferences being held for children not eligible for Part B.” Therefore, OSEP is not accepting the revised baseline of 102%.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)) . The data in the FFY 2005 APR show noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State tracks these data and wishes to include them in the measurement, 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 the denominator of the measurement for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, and the State must provide the specific numbers for its calculation.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure that the State will be able to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)), including</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.
<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 41%, which represent timely correction of 25 of 60 findings. The FFY 2005 data represent progress from the FFY 2004 APR data of 36%.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data and revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must provide timelines and resources for each improvement activity related to this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not submit a baseline in the FFY 2004 SPP submission. In the FFY 2005 SPP resubmission, the State provided a baseline of 36%.</p> <p>The State submitted actual target data of 41% on page 17 of the APR. It is unclear whether these data are based on noncompliance that was identified in 2004-2005 and corrected in 2005-2006, so that the one year timeline for correction has run.</p> <p>As required in OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter, the State provided information in its revised SPP regarding how it monitors all EI providers.</p> <p>OSEP's March 23, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 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. The data in the FFY 2005 APR show noncompliance.</p> <p>The State provided data for this indicator indicating 41%. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that the State will be able 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 data regarding the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004. 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 identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
10. Percent of signed written	The State's FFY 2005 reported data	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>for this indicator are 100%, with 8 complaints filed.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>its FFY 2005 target of 100%. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance, and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not receive any hearing requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>The State did not receive any hearing requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</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; New]</p>	<p>The State did not receive any hearing requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p>	<p>The State provided information regarding its procedural safeguards. OSEP is not reviewing that information for purposes of meeting the Part C application requirements, and assumes that the description is not the State's full policies and procedures.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>No mediations held.</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%. Although the State did not provide a percentage for its FFY 2005 reported data, the State acknowledged that it</p>	<p>The State did not provide a description of its mechanisms for ensuring valid and reliable data.</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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>continues to work out complexities in its data system, and that some data submissions were untimely.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made.</p>	<p>APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State must provide its FFY 2006 data as a percentage.</p>