

**Missouri Part C FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<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 69%. OSEP cannot determine whether progress was made because the State changed its timely standard for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine if the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to Indicator 1 because the categories of findings listed in Indicator 9 do not specifically correlate to Indicator 1.</p>	<p>As required by OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter, the State revised its timely standard for this indicator. The State also revised an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP. OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit, in its FFY 2005 APR, data demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). The data in the February 1, 2007 APR show noncompliance.</p> <p>In its FFY 2005 APR, the State indicated that due to the method of obtaining its FFY 2005 data, it was unknown how many of the services not received in a timely fashion were due to family or parent reasons. If the State wishes to collect these data, and include them in the compliance calculation, the number of children for whom the timely receipt of services was not met due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and denominator of the calculation 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 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 96.9%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. While the State's targets for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments do not demonstrate an increase from its FFY 2004 baseline, because the State reported more than 95% of infants and toddlers receiving services in natural environments, there is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in maintaining performance. It is important that the State monitor to ensure that IFSP teams make individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		services, in accordance with Part C natural environment requirements.
<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 provided.	<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>The State did not provide criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” The State must describe how it will determine outcomes to be comparable to same-aged peers 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>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. 93.5%</p> <p>4B. 95.6%</p> <p>4C. 98.5% and 97.8%, see analysis column for issue regarding baseline data for 4C.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts the targets and improvement activities as the targets maintain a high level of performance (above 95%). OSEP could not determine which of the two data sets the State submitted in the APR is the FFY 2005 baseline data for Indicator 4C. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify which data set is the FFY 2005 baseline for Indicator 4C and revise its SPP to identify those data.</p> <p>The State included four of the questions from its survey in the narrative regarding this indicator in the SPP, but did not provide a copy of the survey. With the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must provide a copy of the survey.</p>
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>section 618 are .71%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of .70%.</p>	<p>OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 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 FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.48%. The State's FFY 2004 data were 1.53%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.55%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</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>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 90.9%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 75.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported timely correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</p>	<p>As requested in OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter, the State submitted updated data regarding this indicator in a letter dated May 31, 2006. As noted in OSEP's July 2006 grant award letter, the State's May 31, 2006 submission provided OSEP with updated information and data that indicate continued improvement in this area.</p> <p>In the APR, the State provided data showing that it monitored two agencies in 2004-2005, that it made findings of noncompliance with the 45-day timeline in both agencies, and that both corrected the noncompliance within one year from identification.</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 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>
<p>8A. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 60.1%. This</p>	<p>The State added an improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 45.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine if the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to Indicator 8A because the categories of findings listed in Indicator 9 do not specifically correlate to Indicator 8A.</p>	<p>accepts that revision.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 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 §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). The data in the February 1, 2007 APR show noncompliance, but they represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data.</p> <p>The State reported that implementation of its improvement activities have "resulted in clearing all noncompliance related to these indicators for all SPOEs and all but one DMH Regional Center as of January 31, 2007." Under Indicator 9, the State reported that 90% of noncompliance identified regarding "transition" was corrected within one year, but did not provide data specific to Indicator 8A.</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 §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and any remaining 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 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 64%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 45.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>As stated in this chart under Indicator 8A, OSEP cannot determine if the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to Indicator 8B.</p>	<p>The State added one improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 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 §303.148(b)(1). The data in the February 1, 2007 APR show continuing noncompliance, but it represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data.</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 §303.148(b)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and any remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</p>
<p>8C. Percent of all children exiting</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data</p>	<p>The State added one improvement activity for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>for this indicator are 57%. This represents progress from the State's FFY 2004 data of 46.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>As stated in this chart under Indicator 8A, OSEP cannot determine if the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 related to Indicator 8C.</p>	<p>accepts the revision.</p> <p>OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to submit, in its FFY 2005 APR, data demonstrating 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, but they represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data.</p> <p>In its FFY 2005 APR, 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 transition conference was not held due to documented exceptional family circumstances would be included in both the numerator and denominator of the calculation 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 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and any remaining 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 95.5%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 76.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>As requested in OSEP's March 14, 2006 SPP response letter, the State submitted updated data regarding this indicator in a letter dated May 31, 2006. As noted in OSEP's July 2006 grant award letter, the State's May 31, 2006 submission provided OSEP with updated information and data that indicate continued improvement in this area.</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 requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b), including correction of any remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2004.</p> <p>As explained above in Indicators 1 and 8, the categories of findings listed in Indicator 9 do not specifically correlate to the APR indicators. In its response to Indicator 9 in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		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.
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]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%, based on 14 reports issued within the 60-day timeline and 5 reports issued within extended timelines. The State met 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 demonstrate continued compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State reported that there were no fully adjudicated hearings during the FFY 2005 reporting period.	The State reported that there were no fully adjudicated Part C hearings during the FFY 2005 reporting period.  As requested in OSEP's March 14, 2006 FFY 2004 SPP response letter, and as noted in OSEP's July 2006 grant award letter, the State submitted a written assurance confirming that it is using the 30-day timeline which does not provide for extensions under the Part C due process hearing procedures.
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]	Not applicable because Part B due process procedures have not been adopted.	Not applicable because Part B due process procedures have not been adopted.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation	The State reported that no mediations were requested or held	The State reported that it did not receive any Part C mediation requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>during the FFY 2005 reporting period. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.</p>	<p>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 State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93%. OSEP could not determine whether the State made progress because the FFY 2004 data were submitted in a different format. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</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>