

District of Columbia Part C SPP/FFY 2005APR 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 37%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 88%.</p> <p>The District did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The District did not address whether prior noncompliance under this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>The District revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Page 2 of the FFY 2005 APR indicates that untimely service provision occurred due to family circumstances or provider delays. OSEP is not able to determine the percentage of untimely services directly attributable to exceptional documented family circumstances. If the State collects these data and wishes to include them in the compliance calculation to improve its performance data under this indicator, the number of children for whom Part C service provision was delayed due to documented exceptional family circumstances must be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the calculation for this Indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the District to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). The District's data indicate continuing noncompliance and slippage.</p> <p>The District must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the District to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and any 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.</p>	<p>The District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 55%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 90%.</p> <p>The District did not meet its FFY</p>	<p>The District revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP encourages the District to utilize the related requirements document to determine possible causal factors contributing to the low performance and evaluate if its improvement activities will result in improving performance</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	2005 target of 92%.	and meeting its targets by the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.
<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 District did not report entry data or strategies that describe how data will be collected so that the District will be able to provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>It is unclear to OSEP whether the District's plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the District'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>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; New]</p>	<p>The District provided more than one set of baseline data ranging from 46.9% to 89.1% and it is unclear which data represent the baseline for 4A, 4B, and 4C.</p> <p>In addition, the District provided targets for FFY 2006 through FFY 2010 of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>An improvement activity was provided in the revised SPP.</p>	<p>The District provided targets and an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the targets and improvement activity because the targets are set at or above 95%. The District may wish to review and revise its targets once its baseline data are clarified (as discussed below).</p> <p>OSEP could not determine which of the data sets the District submitted in its revised SPP is the FFY 2005 baseline data. In the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the District must clarify its FFY 2005 baseline data for 4A, 4B, and 4C and revise its SPP to clearly identify its baseline data.</p> <p>Also, the State did not indicate the extent to which its FFY 2005 data were representative of its population. The State must provide information in the FFY 2006 APR confirming whether its parent survey response rate for its FFY 2006 data was representative of the population served.</p>
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared</p>	<p>The District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.23%. The District met its</p>	<p>The District revised its FFY 2004 baseline data for accuracy and revised its targets for this indicator. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>revised FFY 2005 target of .80%. (The District's FFY 2004 baseline are .57%.)</p>	<p>The District met its target and OSEP appreciates the District's efforts to improve 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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.68%. The District met its FFY 2005 target of 1.60%.</p>	<p>The District's FFY 2004 reported data under IDEA section 618 are 1.3%, which data serve as the District's baseline for this indicator.</p> <p>The District met its target and OSEP appreciates the District'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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 60%, with its last quarter data for FFY 2005 as 92% submitted on May 31, 2006. The State did not meet its target of 100%. The FFY 2004 data were 84%.</p> <p>The District did not address whether prior noncompliance under this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>The District revised the baseline data and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the District to provide data demonstrating compliance with the requirement for conducting evaluations within 45 days of referral. OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter also directed the District to include data to demonstrate compliance with the 45-day timeline initial IFSP meeting requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2) and 303.342(a).</p> <p>The 45-day timeline requirement is an area of longstanding noncompliance for the District, originally identified in OSEP's June 18, 2002 Monitoring Report. OSEP's June 26, 2003 letter accepted the District's plan to ensure compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements and required a final report demonstrating compliance by June 26, 2004.</p> <p>On May 31, 2006, the District submitted documentation indicating 92% compliance with the 45-day timeline requirement for evaluations in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2) and 303.322(e)(1). However, the District's FFY 2005 APR</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>data submitted on February 1, 2007 indicate 60% compliance, which represents slippage and the District did not address whether prior noncompliance was corrected. The slippage in this area of longstanding noncompliance is a factor in the Department's determination under IDEA section 616 of the District's performance in implementing the requirements of Part C of the IDEA.</p> <p>The District must implement and evaluate its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the District to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements for both evaluations and initial IFSP meetings in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2005 and any outstanding noncompliance findings 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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 80%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 100%.</p> <p>The District did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>There were no previously identified findings under this indicator to correct.</p>	<p>The District must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the District to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the IFSP transition planning requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of any noncompliance findings 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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The District met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the District's efforts in achieving the compliance, and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that continue to demonstrate compliance.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 88%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 95.8%.</p> <p>The District did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the District to provide data demonstrating compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)).</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, 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 requirement in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9), including correction of any noncompliance findings 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 District did not provide data on timely correction and indicated that due to resource challenges, the District had not implemented all monitoring activities.</p> <p>This represents slippage from FFY 2004 when the District, although it did not provide a specific percentage of compliance for FFY 2004, reported that it identified noncompliance and corrected some areas of noncompliance.</p>	<p>The District revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 15, 2006 SPP response letter required the District to confirm that it requires noncompliance it identified to be corrected within one year of identification (and not one year from the date of the CAP). The District did not provide this confirmation.</p> <p>In addition, the District was directed to include in the February 1, 2007 APR updated monitoring data demonstrating timely correction. The District indicated that due to resource challenges, the District had not implemented its SPP monitoring activities during FFY 2005.</p> <p>Lack of monitoring by the District (to identify and correct noncompliance with Part C requirements) is a finding identified in OSEP's June 18, 2002 Monitoring Report and in OSEP's December 13, 2003 verification letter. The District has made progress since 2003 in its ability to identify</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance and reported correction of some areas of noncompliance in its FFY 2004 APR. However, the slippage during FFY 2005 remains a concern. The slippage in this area of longstanding noncompliance is a factor in the Department's determination under IDEA section 616 of the District's performance in implementing the requirements of Part C of the IDEA.</p> <p>The District must implement and evaluate its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the District to include data in the FFY 2006 APR that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including data on the correction of outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p> <p>In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the District must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of any findings made in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 and the status of correction. The District must, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C, specifically identify and address the correction of 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 District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, based on the adjudication of one written complaint.</p> <p>The District met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the District's efforts in achieving compliance.</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 District did not receive any due process hearing requests during the reporting period.</p>	<p>The District did not receive any hearing requests during the reporting period.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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). [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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The District reported that there were no mediations held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>The District is not required to provide or meet its targets or provide 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The District's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 50%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 100%. The District did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The District reported 50% as its FFY 2005 data for this indicator, but did not provide the basis for its calculation. OSEP is available to provide technical assistance on conducting the percentage calculation for this indicator. As noted above, the District provided neither entry data nor its plan to collect data under Indicator 3 and did not provide the required data under Indicator 9. The District must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the District to include 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. The District must also provide in the FFY 2006 APR the basis (or raw numbers) for its calculation.</p>