

Michigan 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 reported two sets of data and it is unclear which is the FFY 2005 reported data. Neither set of data meets the State's FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2004 data are based on family interview data, which are not comparable to either set of data reported in the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR clarification of its FFY 2004 data. The State clarified that its FFY 2004 baseline data were calculated using family interview data.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to 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) and including the number of delays attributable to documented family circumstances. In the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported monitoring data showing 19% compliance and self-assessment data showing 70.82% compliance, without designating either as the State's FFY 2005 reported data. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify which data are the FFY 2005 reported data.</p> <p>The State reported that it was unable to factor family delays into its FFY 2005 compliance calculation for this indicator. If the State collects this data and wishes to include it in the FFY 2006 APR, the number of such delays would be included in both the numerator and denominator of the measurement for this indicator.</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 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 FFY 2004.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 84.2%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 84.41%. The State did not</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR its final progress report, which was due November 25,</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| <p>programs for typically developing children.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>meet its FFY 2005 target of 86%.</p> | <p>2006, demonstrating compliance with the requirement in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii) that IFSPs include a justification when early intervention services will not be provided in the natural environment. FFY 2004 data indicated that 34.1% of IFSPs included the required written justifications. The State did not submit its final progress report on FFY 2005 data regarding compliance with this written justification requirement. In addition to the data reporting requirements under this indicator, the State must also submit data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.344(d)(1)(ii).</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> | <p>Entry data provided.</p> | <p>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> |
| <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</p> | <p>The State reported baseline data as follows:</p> <p>4A. 56%</p> <p>4B. 51%</p> <p>4C. 73%</p> | <p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State did not submit a copy of the parent survey that it is using to report under this indicator. The State must provide the required survey in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| <p>their children's needs; and</p> <p>C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</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>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.03%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 1.1%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.1%.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported in the APR that it intends to revise its eligibility criteria, with a public hearing scheduled in 2007. The State must submit as an amendment to its FFY 2007 grant application, any revisions to its eligibility criteria policies. The policies may not be adopted until they have been subject to the public participation requirements of 34 CFR §§303.110 through 303.113 and if applicable, approved by OSEP.</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>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 2.2%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 2.2%</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 64.8%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 56.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure correction of the noncompliance related to this indicator within one year of identification and include data in the February 1, 2007 APR demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1) and 303.342(a) and including the number of delays attributable to documented</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| [Compliance Indicator] | prior noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner. | <p>exceptional family circumstances. The FFY 2005 data show continuing noncompliance and do not include delays due to exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects data on delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances and wishes to include it in the FFY 2006 APR, the number of such delays would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they 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 2005 and FFY 2004.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter also required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR its final progress report, which was due November 25, 2006, demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.322(c)(3)(ii) and 303.344(a) that each child have a timely, comprehensive, multidisciplinary evaluation and an IFSP that identifies the child's present level of functioning in each of the five developmental areas. The State did not provide the requested data, but reported that service areas had difficulty collecting information on a child's vision and hearing status within the required timeframe. The State must include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.322(c)(3)(ii) and 303.344(a).</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 APR cited a 2006 bulletin on changing its 45-day timeline standard to measure the timeline from referral to the initial IFSP meeting instead of IFSP development. The State reported that its definition of initial IFSP meeting is "a discussion between the service coordinator and the family regarding the proposed resources and supports that align with the family's priorities for the child identified during the eligibility determination process." However, the State's definition must be consistent with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.342(a) and 303.343(a) as to the purpose of the initial IFSP meeting and the persons who are required to attend. The State must revise its definition of initial IFSP meeting and provide a written assurance that the State is complying with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.342(a) and 303.343(a) as an</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| | | amendment to its FFY 2007 grant application. Revisions to the State's Part C 45-day timeline policies may not be adopted until they have been subjected to the public participation requirements of 34 CFR §§303.110 through 303.113 and if applicable, approved by OSEP. |
| <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 59.28%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 44.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure correction of the noncompliance related to this indicator within one year of identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007 demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). FFY 2005 data are 59.28% and show continuing noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they 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 2005 and 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 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 reported that its FFY 2005 data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the LEA notification requirement in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) and its final progress report which was due November 25, 2006. The FFY 2005 data show compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100% and 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 demonstrate continuing compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p> |
| <p>8C. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 84.4%. This</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|---|
| <p>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>represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 65.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP's March 30, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements of this indicator and including the number of delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances and its final progress report, which was due November 25, 2006. Although the FFY 2005 APR data of 84.4% show noncompliance, the State's data represent progress from its FFY 2004 data.</p> <p>The State reported that it was unable to factor documented exceptional family circumstances in its calculation for this indicator. If the State collects these data and wishes to include it in the FFY 2006 APR, the number of such delays would be included in both the numerator and the denominator of the measurement for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise the activities, if appropriate, to ensure they 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)(2)(i) as modified by IDEA section 637(a) (9), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and 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 reported FFY 2005 data on program service areas not in compliance, but did not report on whether the noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 had been timely corrected. The State's FFY 2005 data do not reflect the required measurement for this indicator because the State did not report on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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 its final progress report which was due April 10, 2006. The State provided FFY 2005 data, but not according to the required measurement for this indicator. The State reported data regarding percentage of program service areas noncompliant for this indicator in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005, but did not report data on which programs had timely corrected their noncompliance. The State also reported monitoring data identifying the compliance levels on APR indicators for 12 program service areas at two reporting periods. While these data show that noncompliance was not corrected, there is no indication of whether or not the one-year timeline for correction had expired because the reporting period dates were not specified.</p> <p>In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must report data as</p> |

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>required by the measurement for this indicator as a percent of the number of findings of identified noncompliance that were corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. The State must also 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 IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including data on the correction of the remaining 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, 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State reported that one signed written complaint was received during the reporting period, but that it was withdrawn “before a report was issued.”</p> | <p>The State received one written complaint during the FFY 2005 reporting period, but no Part C complaints with written reports were issued.</p> |
| <p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State reported that it did not receive any hearing requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p> | <p>The State did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the FFY 2005.</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 during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p> | <p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities, until any FFY in which 10 or more resolution meetings 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 during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</p> | <p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities, until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were held.</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 88%. OSEP cannot determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State did not provide FFY 2004 baseline data. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> | <p>The State revised its SPP improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that its FFY 2005 submissions were timely and that three of its submissions for the reporting period had issues with accuracy and reliability, including FFY 2004 data for two indicators, and the State's 618 child count submission. The State provided an explanation and reported on its correction of the 618 data submission.</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 full compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642 and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p> |