

Indiana 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 91%. OSEP cannot determine whether this represents progress, because the State indicated that its FFY 2004 data may have included errors and that the FFY 2004 data did not reflect the measurement for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not provide data on timely correction of noncompliance related to this indicator, because the State indicated that it did not monitor for these findings under its SPP timely standard in FFY 2004.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected within one year of identification and include data in the February 1, 2007 APR demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The FFY 2005 data are 91%, but it is unclear whether the data measure the timely initiation of Part C services in initial IFSPs and new services in subsequent IFSPs. The State indicated that the FFY 2005 data are based on the review of IFSPs written from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006, and did not specify whether that includes all IFSPs.</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 both: (1) measure the timeliness of initiation for new Part C services on all IFSPs (not just initial IFSPs); and (2) demonstrate compliance with the requirements at 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 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 94%.</p>	<p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</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>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional</p>	<p>Entry data 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>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>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 State's reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>4A. 99.9%</p> <p>4B. 99.9%</p> <p>4C. 95.5%</p>	<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>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.62%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 1.40%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit its revised eligibility criteria and system of payments policies, for OSEP's approval, as part of the State's FFY 2006 Part C grant application. The State submitted the policies and OSEP approved the eligibility criteria policies in a May 2006 memorandum and the system of payments policies as part of the State's FFY 2006 Part C grant award process.</p> <p>The State revised the FFY 2004 baseline data and targets for this indicator in its SPP with involvement from its stakeholders and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		<p>While the State’s targets do not demonstrate an increase from the FFY 2004 baseline, the State reported that the revisions are based on the changes to its eligibility criteria and system of payments policies. OSEP’s review of the targets confirms that the targets are above the national identification rate for children ages birth to one year, and the identification rate for States with comparable eligibility criteria.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data for FFY 2005. The State provided FFY 2004 baseline data of 1.69% and FFY 2005 data of 1.40%.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State’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 State’s reported FFY 2005 data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 4.04%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 3.35%.</p>	<p>The State revised the FFY 2004 baseline data for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data for FFY 2005. The State provided FFY baseline data of 3.94% and FFY 2005 data of 3.35%.</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 reported data for this indicator are 99.62%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 98.56%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s March 2, 2006 SPP response letter indicated that OSEP looked forward to data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a). The State submitted FFY 2005 data demonstrating a high level of compliance with these requirements.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing 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 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 100%. 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 §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h)</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>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 2006 SPP response letter indicated that OSEP looked forward to data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). The State submitted FFY 2005 data demonstrating compliance with these requirements.</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 §303.148(b)(1).</p> <p>On pages 23 and 24 of the FFY 2005 APR, the State indicated that it excluded from its calculations for this indicator cases in which the parent did not consent to providing child information to the LEA. Unless a State has adopted a written notice and opt-out policy, IDEA section 637(a)(9) and 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) require that the lead agency notify the LEA, where a child resides, of a child transitioning from Part B. It is unclear whether the State has adopted an opt-out policy under IDEA section 637(a)(9), 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) and OSEP's 2004 Letter to Elder. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify whether it has adopted such an opt-out policy and exclude from its calculations (in both the numerator and denominator) for Indicator 8B, but provide a numerical count of those children whose families elected to opt out. In addition, the State must ensure that such a policy is included in the State's FFY 2007 Part C grant application. If the State has not adopted such a policy, then LEAs must be notified of the child's name, date of birth, and parent contact</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		information as required by IDEA section 637(a)(9) and 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).
<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 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data from a source other than family surveys demonstrating compliance with the transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i). The State submitted FFY 2005 data collected from the System Point of Entry electronic database demonstrating 96% compliance with the transition conference requirements.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing 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 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>For its FFY 2005 APR reported data under this indicator, the State adopted the findings of noncompliance identified in OSEP's March 2, 2006 SPP response letter and reported that the findings were partially corrected in a timely manner. However, the FFY 2005 data do not reflect the measurement for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 2, 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. Although the State's SPP submitted in December 2005 and the FFY 2005 APR indicate that the State conducted monitoring activities, the State reported FFY 2005 data for this indicator according to the correction of noncompliance identified in OSEP's March 2, 2006 SPP response letter. The State indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eight of nine program clusters were at 99.5% to 100% compliance for the 45-day timeline requirements (Indicator 7); • Noncompliance for LEA notification (Indicator 8B) was corrected; and • 96% compliance for transition conference requirements (Indicator 8C) and the one-year correction timeline has not lapsed. <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data do not reflect the measurement for this indicator because the data do not report a percent of the number of findings of State identified noncompliance and the number of those findings that were corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identification.</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 reflect the measurement for this indicator and demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including data on the correction of remaining noncompliance reported in the FFY 2005 APR under Indicator 9 relating to Indicators 7 and 8C. 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, 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 two written complaints filed. 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>Not applicable.</p>	<p>The State did not receive any due process 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</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not hold any resolution meetings in FFY 2005 because it did not receive any due process hearing requests.</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution sessions were held.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not hold any mediations in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations are conducted.</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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, as noted above, the FFY 2005 data for Indicator 9 do not reflect the measurement for that indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>While the State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, OSEP's analysis under Indicator 9 above, noting that the State's FFY 2005 data do not reflect the measurement for that indicator, indicates that the State did not meet its FFY 2005 target for this indicator.</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 IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>