

California 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 did not report FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State reported it did not timely correct noncompliance for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to clarify in the FFY 2005 APR whether the State’s timely standard is the “provision of services within 75 days of initial referral” as the SPP indicated. On page 7 of the FFY 2005 APR, the State clarified its timely standard as “the maximum period from parent consent for Part C services until when a child begins to receive those services is 30 days.”</p> <p>The State did not submit FFY 2005 data for this indicator. The State indicated that it is designing a new reporting process for this indicator that will provide valid and reliable data, and that it would report data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 in the FFY 2006 APR. It is unclear to OSEP whether: (1) the State’s reported FFY 2004 APR data of 96.54% are valid and reliable and (2) the State’s plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the State’s ability to provide valid and reliable FFY 2006 data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include: (1) valid and reliable data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008; and (2) data 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 and outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</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 72.09%. OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage because the State’s FFY 2004 reported data were inaccurate, as noted in OSEP’s December 18, 2006 verification letter. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that stakeholders were involved in the decision to revise the State’s targets.</p> <p>OSEP’s December 18, 2006 verification visit letter concluded that the State’s system could not collect data on children receiving Part C services primarily in programs designed for typically developing children, and thus, could not ensure accurate settings data under IDEA section 618 and Indicator 2. OSEP’s letter required the State to provide an assurance confirming the accuracy of its section</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	83.5%.	<p>618 settings data. The State's FFY 2005 APR indicated that the State used its revised procedures to report its FFY 2005 IDEA section 618 settings data and data for this indicator.</p> <p>It is also important that the State 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>
<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>	Entry data not provided.	<p>The State did not report the required entry data and activities.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include a revised sampling plan in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. The State provided sampling information utilized for data collection in FFY 2005. The State reported sampling activities are not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible for technical assistance.</p> <p>It is unclear to OSEP whether the State's plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the State's ability to provide valid and reliable baseline data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. OSEP is available to provide technical assistance.</p> <p>The State must provide entry and 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> <p>A. Know their rights;</p> <p>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>4A. 48%</p> <p>4B. 42%</p> <p>4C. 71%</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities, and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include a revised sampling plan in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007. The State provided sampling information utilized for data collection in FFY 2005. The State reported sampling activities are not technically sound. Please call your State Contact as soon as possible for technical assistance.</p> <p>The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1,</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		2008.
<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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.14%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of .95%.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
<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 1.99%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 1.76%.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
<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 90.43%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 72.38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported it did not timely correct noncompliance for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that the identified noncompliance was corrected and include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p> <p>The State did not report data regarding the number of delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the compliance calculation, the number of children for whom the 45-day timeline was not met due to documented exceptional family</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>circumstances would be included in both numerator and the denominator of the calculation for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must implement and evaluate 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 §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and outstanding 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 reported data for this indicator are 85.71%.</p> <p>OSEP questions whether the monitoring data under Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C are representative of the State because they are based on the State's review of 14 files and the State reported serving 32,268 children under Part C during FFY 2005. If such data were accurate, the data would represent slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 90.24%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not timely correct noncompliance for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p> <p>The State's data for this indicator are based on a child record review of 14 files. OSEP questions whether the number of files reviewed can provide data representative of the State as the State reported serving 32,268 children under Part C during FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must implement and evaluate its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data representative of the State that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 92.86%.</p> <p>As noted under Indicator 8A, OSEP questions whether the data are representative. If they are, the data</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>would represent progress from the FFY 2004 data of 91.89%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not timely correct noncompliance for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported monitoring data may not be representative of the State. The State must implement and evaluate its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data representative of the State that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</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:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 92.86%.</p> <p>As noted under Indicator 8A, OSEP questions whether the data are representative. If they are, they would represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 88.37%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not timely correct noncompliance for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter required the State to include data in the February 1, 2007 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as revised by IDEA section 637(a)(9)).</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported monitoring data may not be representative of the State. The State must implement and evaluate 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, data representative of the State that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(2)(i) (as revised by IDEA section 637(a)(9)), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</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 1.43%, which reflects timely correction of 1 of 70 findings.</p> <p>These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2004 baseline data of 5.85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter and December 18, 2006 verification visit letter required the State to include, in the February 1, 2007 APR, data that demonstrate that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible but not later than one year of its identification.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to provide data demonstrating compliance with the requirement in 34 CFR §303.344(a)(1), that IFSPs include a statement of the child's present level of developmental functioning. The State reported on its efforts to ensure compliance with the</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>requirements in 34 CFR §303.344(a) and OSEP appreciates those efforts.</p> <p>However, in reporting its FFY 2005 data under this indicator, the State did not disaggregate its other timely correction data by indicator or substantive finding area. The State must implement and evaluate its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to report 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).</p> <p>In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must also 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, 8C and 14, 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, based on the timely resolution of seven written complaints filed.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 50%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter stated that while Part C's 30-day timeline does not allow extensions generally, the very limited family-specific exceptions identified by California did not reflect noncompliance and OSEP determined, at that time, that no further action was required.</p> <p>OSEP's December 18, 2006 verification visit letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the 30-day</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>timeline in 34 CFR §303.423(b) for the hearing requests filed between July 1, 2005 through December 31, 2006, and for those for which extensions were granted beyond 30 days, the State’s analysis of the noncompliance. The State was also directed to include its plan to ensure timely issuance of due process hearing decisions. The State’s FFY 2005 APR indicated that of 10 adjudicated hearings, five were adjudicated within the 30-day timeline, and four were issued within an “extended timeline.”</p> <p>The State must implement and evaluate 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 §303.423(b), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. In addition, the State must provide in the FFY 2006 APR information for any adjudicated due process hearing in FFY 2006 that exceeded the 30-day timeline, the reason(s) for the delay and the actual number of days required for full adjudication.</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>Not applicable.</p>	<p>The State has adopted the Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2005 data do not reflect the measurement for this indicator. The State included only those mediations related to due process hearing requests instead of all mediations conducted.</p>	<p>On page 36 of the APR, the State reported that for FFY 2005, 106 mediations were requested of which 36 related to due process. The State indicated “not applicable” for the remaining 70 mediations. The State must include in the calculation for this indicator all mediations held.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data that reflect the appropriate measurement and demonstrate improvement in performance.</p>

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 did not meet its target of 100% for this indicator and OSEP could not determine whether progress was made.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance and also required the State to confirm the accuracy of data reported under IDEA sections 616 and 618.</p> <p>Although the State did not provide a specific percentage that reflects its FFY 2005 performance data for this indicator, the State did not meet its 100% target for this indicator. The State did not provide any FFY 2005 data for Indicator 1 and the FFY 2005 data under Indicator 13 do not reflect the correct measurement. OSEP will be providing further technical assistance on calculating a percentage for the measurement under this indicator.</p> <p>The State must provide data in the FFY 2006 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.</p>