

Wisconsin Part C
Table A -- Issues Identified In The State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 1:</p> <p>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance:</p> <p>The State's timely standard is based on the timeliness of the primary service, which is inconsistent with the Part C regulations at 34 CFR §§303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The lead agency must ensure the timely provision of all early intervention services on the IFSP that are consented to by the parent.</p> <p>Other:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State submitted baseline data based only on family surveys, which are not reliable as the sole source of data in determining compliance with this indicator. 2. The State's timely standard begins with the IFSP meeting date. The Part C regulations at 34 CFR §§303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) require that the lead agency provide the early intervention services that are consented to by the parent as soon as possible after the IFSP meeting. OSEP assumes that the IFSP meeting date is when a parent consents to the provision of early intervention services under 34 CFR §303.404(a)(2). 	<p>Noncompliance:</p> <p>In the FFY 2005 APR due February 2, 2007, the State must submit: (1) a revised definition of timely that makes clear that its timely standard applies to the provision of <i>all</i> early intervention services on the IFSP; and (2) data based on the timely provision of all early intervention services on the IFSP.</p> <p>Other:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State must include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, valid and reliable data (which may include monitoring findings). 2. The State must confirm in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007 that the IFSP meeting date is when a parent consents to the provision of early intervention services under 34 CFR §303.404(a)(2).
<p>Indicator 5:</p> <p>Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>The State did not provide the comparisons required under Indicator 5 between the percent of infants and toddlers birth to one year with IFSPs and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data. 	<p>The State must include this information in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 7:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>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>See Table B for previously identified issues relating to Indicator 7.</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>
<p>Indicator 8:</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>The State submitted baseline data based only on family surveys, community partner surveys, and county policy and procedure description surveys, which are not reliable as the sole sources of data in determining compliance with this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must include in the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, valid and reliable data (which may include monitoring findings).</p>

SPP Indicator	Issue	Required Action
<p>Indicator 9:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>Noncompliance:</p> <p>The State reported a 96% level of compliance for Indicator 9B in the SPP, specifically, the requirement at 34 CFR §303.501. While this level of compliance is below 100% and requires improvement activities to achieve full compliance, OSEP recognizes the effort made by the State in working toward compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>See Table B for previously identified issues relating to Indicator 9.</p> <p>Other:</p> <p>The State did not provide baseline data for Indicator 9A except with respect to the transition planning conference requirements of 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) that are associated with Indicator 8C.</p>	<p>Noncompliance:</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Other:</p> <p>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>Indicator 13:</p> <p>Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p>	<p>The State included improvement activities regarding mediation; however, baseline data indicated that the 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.</p>	<p>The State may remove the improvement activities related to mediation in the APR, due February 1, 2007, if the number of mediations for 2004-2005 is less than 10. 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.</p>