

Virginia Part C SPP/FFY 2005 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 72%. This represents the same percent from the FFY 2004 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not identify any noncompliance findings in FFY 2004 with the requirements of this indicator.</p>	<p>The State revised the timelines for 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 include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating that infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. In addition, the State was required to confirm that the IFSP meeting date is when the parent consents to the provision of early intervention services. The State provided information confirming that the IFSP meeting date is when the parent consents to the provision of early intervention services.</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 timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(1), 303.322(e)(2) and 303.342(a), including correction of any noncompliance findings 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 99%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of 98.42%.</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 include in the February 1, 2007 APR both accurate baseline data from FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 progress data. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State met its target and OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. It is important that the State also monitor to ensure that the determination of settings in which infants and toddlers with disabilities receive early intervention services is individualized on the IFSP.</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p>	<p>Entry data provided.</p>	<p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide child outcome progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>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. 65.8%</p> <p>4B. 61.9%</p> <p>4C. 77.6%</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 reported data for this indicator under IDEA section 618 are .51%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of .58%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of .62%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported slippage and OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<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 data under IDEA section 618 are 1.72%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 1.79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 1.9%.</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 receiving 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 98%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported timely correction in FFY 2005 of 16 of the 20 (or 80%) findings from FFY 2004, and provided updated data reflecting that two systems that had findings from FFY 2004 had corrected and the remaining two systems were at 95% and 99%.</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 include in the February 1, 2007 APR data that demonstrate compliance with Part C's 45-day timeline requirement.</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), 303.222(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of any noncompliance findings 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 preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 86%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 84%. 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 those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include, in the February 1, 2007 APR, data that demonstrated compliance with the IFSP transition planning requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). The State reported that, in FFY 2005, 18 of 40 local systems were identified as being in noncompliance with the requirements of this indicator.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>The State must implement and evaluate 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)(1), including correction data for the 18 local systems with noncompliance findings made 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: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 89%. This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 81%. 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 those revisions. OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.348(b)(1). The State reported that, in FFY 2005, 12 of 40 local systems were identified as being in noncompliance with the requirements of this indicator. 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 data for the 12 local systems with noncompliance findings made in FFY 2005.</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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP calculated the State's FFY 2005 data as 75.36% (or 269/357). This represents progress from the FFY 2004 data of 51%. 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 those revisions. OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as amended by IDEA section 637(a)(9)), that for all children receiving early intervention services under Part C and potentially eligible under Part B, a transition conference is convened, with the approval of the family, between the lead agency, the family, and the LEA at least 90 days and, at the discretion of the parties, up to nine months, before the child is eligible for the preschool services. OSEP calculated the State's FFY 2005 data as 75.36% as follows. The State reviewed records of 533 children receiving Part C services and considered potentially eligible for Part B. For 176 of these children, the State indicated that</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference. OSEP subtracted 176 from 533 to obtain a denominator of 357 for this indicator. The State indicated that the transition conference was held for 287 of the families that provide approval for the transition conference, of which 18 were delayed due to scheduling or other system reasons and 49 of which were delayed due to documented exceptional family circumstances. Thus, the transition conference was not held for 70 children. Therefore, OSEP's calculation for this indicator is 269 (287 – 18) divided by 357, or 75.36%.</p> <p>The State also reported that, in FFY 2005, 21 of 40 local systems were identified as being in noncompliance with the requirements of this indicator.</p> <p>The State must implement and evaluate 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), including correction data for the 12 local systems with noncompliance findings made 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's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 75%, based on the timely correction of 21 of 28 findings. (The State identified 134 findings during FFY 2005 compared to only two findings in FFY 2004. The one-year correction timeline had lapsed for only 28 of the 134 findings from FFY 2005.)</p> <p>While the FFY 2005 data of 75% appear to represent slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 100%, the FFY 2004 data were based on the timely correction of only two findings.</p> <p>In addition, although the State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of</p>	<p>The State added improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those activities.</p> <p>OSEP's March 13, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR data demonstrating compliance with the requirement that the IFSP include the child's present level of functioning in all five developmental areas, as required by 34 CFR §303.344(a). The State reported in the APR that it made findings of noncompliance regarding this requirement in four local systems in FFY 2004 and ensured timely correction in two of those local systems and followed up on corrective actions with the remaining two local systems, which were at 90% and 95% compliance in FFY 2005. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure compliance with 34 CFR §303.344(a).</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the timely correction requirements in IDEA sections 616(a), 642, and 635(a)(10) and 34 CFR §303.501(b).</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</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	100% during FFY 2005, it reported updated correction data for the remaining seven findings indicating full correction of two findings and correction in the other five with compliance levels ranging from 90% - 99%.	noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 1, 8A, 8B, and 8C, 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 0%; however, this is based on the adjudication of one complaint. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.	The State revised the timelines for the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that the decision for the one signed written complaint was not issued within the 60-day timeline and there were no exceptional circumstances. The fact that the State received only one complaint disproportionately negatively impacts the State's compliance rate for this indicator. While the State is required to ensure that all complaints are timely resolved, the compliance percentage does not accurately describe the State's capacity to resolve complaints in a timely manner.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State did not receive any hearing requests during the reporting period.	The State did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2005 reporting period.
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]	No resolution meetings held.	The State reported that no resolution meetings were held during the FFY 2005 reporting period as no due process hearing requests were received.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>No mediations held.</p>	<p>The State reported that there were no mediations requested or held during the reporting period. The State 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>This indicator measures both the timeliness and accuracy of the State's data submissions to OSEP. The State indicated that the timeliness data for its FFY 2005 data submissions are 83% (the 17% based solely on the late submission of its FFY 2005 child count data). The State indicated that all of its FFY 2005 data submissions were accurate.</p> <p>The FFY 2005 data represent progress from the State's FFY 2004 data in which it rated itself 83% for timeliness and indicated accuracy issues with one of 14 SPP indicators and also with its IDEA section 618 settings data.</p> <p>Although the State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100% for timeliness in FFY 2005, the State identified its plan to ensure the timeliness of its FFY 2006 data submissions.</p>	<p>The State revised the 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 include in the February 1, 2007 APR documentation demonstrating 100% accuracy and timeliness of all data submitted under IDEA sections 616 and 618. The State addressed both timeliness and accuracy although it did not provide one percentage to address both measures. OSEP will be providing technical assistance on the measurement for this indicator for the FFY 2006 APR.</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, 618, and 642, and 34 CFR §§303.176 and 303.540.</p>