

**Table B – Massachusetts Part C
Previously-Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 8A: OSEP’s April 28, 2005 letter accepted Massachusetts’ November 2004 plan to ensure compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and indicated that Massachusetts must provide a progress report in the SPP and a final progress report with data demonstrating compliance within 30 days following one year from that letter (or by May 28, 2006).</p>	<p>Massachusetts reported in the SPP, page 27, that, according to provider interview data, “72.3% of ALL children discharged (regardless of age of discharge), based on exiting data from OSEP’s Table 3, had a ‘yes’ answer to ‘Was the individual transition plan fully developed?’ ”</p>	<p>The data indicate continuing noncompliance. Baseline data is limited to provider interview survey data. Other data such as monitoring data and/or State Management System data were not provided. OSEP could not determine how many provider interviews were conducted or the representation of Massachusetts.</p>	<p>Massachusetts must submit a final progress report with valid and reliable data demonstrating compliance with 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) within 30 days following one year from OSEP’s April 28, 2005 APR letter (by May 28, 2006). Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may result in Massachusetts being identified as a “high risk” grantee or otherwise affect Massachusetts’ FFY 2006 grant award.</p>
<p>Indicator 8B: OSEP’s October 21, 2005 FFY 2003 APR letter directed Massachusetts to provide in the SPP data on whether it was in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). If the data indicated noncompliance, OSEP’s October 2005 letter directed Massachusetts to include a plan in the SPP to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>Massachusetts reported in the SPP, page 27, that, according to provider interview data, “61.5% of children discharged from EI and potentially eligible for Part B, had a ‘yes’ answer to ‘was the LEA invited?’ on the Transition Survey on the Annual Report/Self-Assessment.”</p>	<p>Massachusetts reported a 61.5% level of compliance for Indicator 8B in the SPP, specifically the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). Baseline data was based on provider interview survey, which did not necessarily include questions that would measure compliance with this indicator.</p>	<p>Massachusetts must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Massachusetts should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable Massachusetts to include valid and reliable data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of Massachusetts’ status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>
<p>Indicator 8C: OSEP’s October 21, 2005, FFY 2003 APR response letter required Massachusetts to report in the SPP data on whether it was in compliance with the requirement to</p>	<p>Massachusetts reported in the SPP, page 27, that according to provider interview data, “85.2% of children discharged from EI and potentially eligible for Part B had a ‘yes’ answer to ‘Did a</p>	<p>Massachusetts reported an 85.2% level of compliance for Indicator 8C in the SPP, specifically the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i).</p>	<p>Massachusetts must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Massachusetts should review</p>

Table B – Massachusetts Part C

Previously-Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>convene transition conferences, with the approval of the family, under 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2), at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. If the data indicate noncompliance, Massachusetts was also to include with the SPP its plan to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>Transition conference occur for this child?”</p>	<p>Baseline data was based on provider interview survey, which did not necessarily include questions that would measure compliance with this indicator.</p>	<p>and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable Massachusetts to include valid and reliable data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of Massachusetts’ status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>