

Table B– New Hampshire Part C

Previously Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 8C: In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP requested that the State submit, in the SPP, data and information to fully demonstrate compliance or progress in correcting the following area of noncompliance and a final progress report not later than 30 days from one-year of the date of the APR response letter: ensure that a transition meeting is held 90 days prior to a child's third birthday as required by 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i).</p>	<p>The State submitted its report, dated December 2, 2005 and February 6, 2006, demonstrating that, in FFY 2004, 47% of its transition meetings under 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) occurred at least 90 days prior to a child's third birthday during 2004-2005.</p> <p>In the SPP, the State reported FFY 2003 data indicating 28% compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i).</p>	<p>The State provided data that, while indicating improvement, demonstrate continuing significant noncompliance with the requirement to ensure that a transition meeting is held 90 days prior to a child's third birthday as required by 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i).</p> <p>In the State's computation of its data, the State may have included children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference or for whom the conference was not timely held due to documented exceptional child or family circumstances.</p>	<p>The State may submit its final progress report due October 29, 2006 with its FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. The State must ensure that it is implementing its improvement strategies to enable the State to include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time will affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State should not include in the calculation children for whom the State has identified the lack of a timely conference attributable either to exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child's record or lack of family approval. 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 and the number of children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference.</p>