

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

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State reported that its standard for untimely services is “any service not available to be provided within 30 days of the start date projected on the IFSP.” The State’s timely standard 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 “start date projected on the IFSP” 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 that date.</p> <p>See also Table B.</p>	<p>The State must revise its timely standard and may use a starting point consistent with the Part C regulations, which can be the point 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.</p> <p>The State must submit its revised standards and data in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007.</p> <p>See also Table B.</p>
	<p>Other: In the State’s computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator, the State may have included children for whom reasonable delays were attributable to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record.</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 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 family circumstances.</p>

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

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: See Table B.</p>	<p>See Table B.</p>
<p>Indicator 8: 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: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services; B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: Indicators 8A, 8B and 8C: See Table B.</p>	<p>See Table B.</p>
	<p>Indicator 8C - Other: In the State's computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator (8C), the State may have included children for whom reasonable delays were attributable to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record. In the State's computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator (8C), the State may have also included children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference.</p>	<p>Indicator 8C: 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 cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record or children for whom the family did not provide 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 family circumstance.</p>

Table A – Idaho Part C
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 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. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance: The State reported that findings of noncompliance related to the priority areas were not corrected within one year from identification. The State included improvement activities to address these findings.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that the noncompliance it identifies is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>