

**Table A Chart – Arizona Part C  
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan**

<b>SPP Indicator</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Required Action</b>
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State’s timely standard (within 30 days of the start date on the IFSP) begins with a starting point that is not consistent with the Part C regulations at 34 CFR §§303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The “IFSP service initiation date” is established by the IFSP team, which includes the parent, and may serve as the standard, but the State may not add an additional period to this date.  Noncompliance: See Table B for additional discussion of Indicator 1.</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State must revise its timely standard and may use a starting point consistent with the Part C regulations, such as when a parent consents to the provision of early intervention services under 34 CFR §303.404(a)(2). Alternatively, the State may use “IFSP initiation date” as its standard but must monitor the implementation of this standard to ensure that this date is reasonable when applied to individual IFSPs. The State must submit its revised standard and data in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007.  See Table B for additional discussion of Indicator 1.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 7:</b> 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: See Table B for additional discussion of Indicator 7.  Other: In the State’s computation of its baseline data for this compliance Indicator, the State may have included in its reported percentage, children for whom reasonable delays were attributable to exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child’s record.</p>	<p>Noncompliance: See Table B for additional discussion of Indicator 7.  Other: In its quarterly progress reports under the Compliance Agreement and in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State should not include in the calculation of compliance, children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to child or family circumstances.</p>

<b>SPP Indicator</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Required Action</b>
<p><b>Indicator 9:</b> 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Other: The State did not provide baseline data in the SPP in response to this indicator. The State reported that it would be submitting monitoring data for 9A with the State's March 2006 Compliance Agreement Progress Report.  The State reported 2004-2005 baseline data for 9B and therefore, did not report correction data for 2003-2004.</p>	<p>Other: The State must include, in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, both baseline data from FFY 2004 (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005) and progress data from FFY 2005 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). Failure to include both types of these data will affect OSEP's determination in 2007 of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 13:</b> Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Other: (1) The State included targets and improvement activities regarding mediation; however, baseline data indicated that the total number of mediations requested was fewer than ten. OSEP guidance on developing the SPP indicated that targets and improvement activities were not needed until the number of mediations requested totaled ten or greater.  (2) The State established a target of 100% for mediation. The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. A higher mediation goal, while appropriate for some States, may not be appropriate if it results in agreements that are not voluntarily implemented. It is better to have a lower percentage of viable, implemented agreements than a higher percentage of agreements, some of which are not voluntarily implemented.</p>	<p>Other: (1) The State may remove the targets and improvement activities related to mediation in the APR, due February 1, 2007, if the number of mediations for 2004-2005 is less than ten. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches ten or greater, the State must develop targets and improvement activities, and report them in the corresponding APR.  (2) If the State has a target of 100%, it should revise the target consistent with these instructions and submit the revised target in the APR, due February 1, 2007. For rates above 85%, the State may want to review its target, determine if an adjustment is needed and submit the revised target in that APR.</p>