

Table B – Part C (Pennsylvania)

Previously Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>1. Indicator 8A: IFSPs with transition steps and services (34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h)).</p> <p>OSEP identified noncompliance regarding transition steps on the IFSP in its February 2002 Monitoring Report. In a letter dated March 19, 2003, OSEP accepted the State’s plan to correct the noncompliance. The State was required to submit its final progress report with its FFY 2002 APR, which was due by June 30, 2004. In its September 2004 and September 2005 letters regarding the State’s FFY 2002 and 2003 APRs, OSEP asked for clarification of the State’s data.</p> <p>2: Indicator 8C: Transition conferences, if child potentially eligible for Part B (34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i)).</p> <p>Based on data in the State’s FFY 2002 APR, OSEP’s September 27, 2004 letter identified noncompliance regarding the transition conference requirement at 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i). In its February 7, 2005 letter, OSEP accepted the State’s plan to address this noncompliance and required Pennsylvania to submit a final Progress Report 30 days following one year from February 7, 2005 that demonstrates correction of noncompliance regarding the transition conference.</p>	<p>1. Indicator 8A: In its SPP, based on child record reviews, the State reported a 76% level of compliance for the transition plans requirement. The State also reported in the SPP that it was on target for implementing its strategies to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In its FFY 2002 APR, the State had reported that 61% of counties were found to be in noncompliance with this requirement in 2002-2003 (FFY 2002 APR, page 43).</p> <p>2: Indicator 8C: OSEP received the State’s final Progress Report on March 6, 2006. In the final Progress Report and the SPP, the State reported a 93% level of compliance with the transition conference requirement for 2004-2005.</p>	<p>1. Indicator 8A: The State reported a 76% level of compliance for Indicator 8A in the SPP, specifically the requirements at 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) regarding transition steps in the IFSP, which indicates continuing noncompliance. OSEP cannot determine whether this data indicates that the State has made progress in this area.</p> <p>2: Indicator 8C: The State reported a 93% level of compliance for Indicator 8C in the Final Progress Report and SPP, specifically the requirement 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) regarding transition conferences. The State has shown progress in this area.</p> <p>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>1. Indicator 8A: In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with this requirement, and correction data regarding the monitoring findings reported in the FFY 2002 APR. The State should review and, if necessary, revise its improvement strategies 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 will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>2: Indicator 8C: The State reported a 93% level of compliance with the requirement at 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i). While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires continued implementation of improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Other: 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</p>

Table B – Part C (Pennsylvania)
Previously Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
			<p>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 and the number of children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference.</p>