

### Rhode Island 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 64.81%. This represents slippage from the revised FFY 2004 data of 65.73%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance related to this indicator was timely corrected.</p>	<p>The State revised its timeliness standard, FFY 2004 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 required the State to review and, if necessary, revise its improvement activities and include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) a revised timeliness standard; (2) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this indicator; and (3) data that include delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. As indicated, the State revised its timeliness standard. The data reported in the February 1, 2007 APR show continuing noncompliance and do not include delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances. If the State collects data on delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances and wishes to include this data 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.</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 91.41%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 94.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 95%.</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>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</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>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>C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>Baseline, targets and improvement activities provided.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2005 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>4A. 82.9%</p> <p>4B. 88.5%</p> <p>4C. 89.2%</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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are 1.86%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>of 1.75%.</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 4.09%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2005 target of 3.60%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP 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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 71.70%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 26.49%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance related to this indicator was timely corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to review and, if necessary, revise its improvement activities and include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) a description of how it ensures full compliance with the requirements of this indicator; (2) data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this indicator; and (3) data that include delays due to documented exceptional family circumstances. In the February 1, 2007 APR, the State reported its requirement of ensuring 100% compliance for this indicator and included in its FFY 2005 APR data, including delays attributable to documented exceptional family circumstances. However, the data reported in the February 1, 2007 APR, while indicating progress, continue to show noncompliance.</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 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 transition planning to support the child's transition to</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 79%. This represents progress from FFY 2004</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to ensure that the</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>data of 77%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance related to this indicator was timely corrected.</p>	<p>identified noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected and include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with the requirements for this indicator. The data in the February 1, 2007 APR show continuing noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not provide the actual numbers (raw data) used in its compliance calculation for this indicator. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State must, in addition to reporting the percentage required in this indicator, provide the actual numbers used in the calculation of that percentage.</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 requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of noncompliance 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>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 96%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 93%.</p> <p>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 the revisions.</p> <p>The State did not provide the actual numbers (raw data) used in its compliance calculation for this indicator. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State must, in addition to reporting the percentage required in this indicator, provide the actual numbers used in the calculation of that percentage.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter to the State reported that OSEP looked forward to data that demonstrated full compliance in the APR due February 1, 2007. The data reported in the February 1, 2007 APR show progress toward achieving compliance.</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 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1), including correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>8C. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data are the same as FFY 2004 data.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the revisions.</p> <p>The State did not provide the actual numbers (raw data) used in its compliance</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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 did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report whether prior noncompliance related to this indicator was timely corrected.</p>	<p>calculation for this indicator. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State must, in addition to reporting the percentage required in this indicator, provide the actual numbers used in the calculation of that percentage.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter to the State reported that the State should not include in its calculation for this indicator children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference and that OSEP looked forward to data that demonstrated full compliance with the requirements under this indicator in the APR due February 1, 2007. The February 1, 2007 APR data are 91% and the State reported that the data do not include families who did not provide approval for the conference.</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 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.</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 that one finding out of 27 findings of noncompliance was corrected within one year from identification and the one-year timeline for another finding had not yet expired.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage because FFY 2004 baseline data were not reported, as the State indicated in its December 2005 SPP that the one-year timeline for 24 findings of noncompliance had not expired.</p>	<p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) information on how the State selects EIS programs for monitoring; (2) data demonstrating that the State ensures the correction of noncompliance, as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification; and (3) its final progress report which was due November 3, 2006.</p> <p>In the FFY 2005 APR, the State provided information on its EIS monitoring selection. However, the FFY 2005 data the State submitted show 27 findings of noncompliance with only one corrected and the timeline for another not yet completed. The data do not specify the FFY in which the noncompliance was identified and appear to include findings that would not usually be corrected at the local program level. In addition, it is unclear whether the 27 findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2005 data include the 24 findings (for which the one-year timeline had not expired) that the State reported under Indicator 9 in its December 2005 SPP. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must clarify whether the FFY 2005 data include these 24 findings of noncompliance and report data on the correction of those 24 findings and any other findings reported in its FFY 2005 data under this indicator.</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
		<p>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 remaining noncompliance from FFY 2004.</p> <p>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 in FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B and 8C, 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 it did not receive any signed written complaints during this reporting period.</p>	<p>The State did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2005 reporting period.</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 requests for due process hearings during this reporting period.</p>	<p>The State did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the FFY 2005 reporting.</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</p>	<p>Not Applicable.</p>	<p>The State has adopted the Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.</p>

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
adopted). [Results Indicator; New]		
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State reported that it did not hold any mediations during this reporting period.	The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	<p>The State revised its targets in the SPP under this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2005 SPP response letter required the State to revise the targets for this indicator to specifically indicate 100% accuracy and 100% timeliness regarding the data reported to OSEP and include in the February 1, 2007 APR: (1) confirmation that its 618 data and the data in the APR are accurate; and (2) its final progress report which was due November 3, 2006.</p> <p>As indicated, the State revised its targets. In addition, in the February 1, 2007 APR, the State assured that it submitted accurate data in the February and November 618 data reports and the FFY 2005 APR.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618 and 642 and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>