

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90.88%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 47.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that eight of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings subsequently were corrected by January 2009.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 was corrected. The State reported that eight of the nine findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected by March 2009. The one local early intervention program with remaining noncompliance participated in a technical assistance call in October 2008. The State also conducted focused monitoring, required the program to update/revise its corrective action plans, and to turn in monthly progress reports.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it has not corrected remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of the FFY 2005 finding and the noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.																
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 92.41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 88.1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 90%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data to respond to OSEP's concern about possible noncompliance for this indicator related to the State's exclusion of 34 files cited in the FFY 2006 response table that did not identify service location. The State reported that the 34 files represented four findings of noncompliance related to the lack of justifications for services that were not provided in the natural environment, and that all four findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.																
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 964 1446 1468"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 964 1075 1149">07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1075 964 1199 1149">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1199 964 1323 1149">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1323 964 1446 1149">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1149 1075 1222">a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1075 1149 1199 1222">0.4</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1149 1323 1222">0.2</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1149 1446 1222">0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1222 1075 1362">b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1075 1222 1199 1362">20.0</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1222 1323 1362">17.7</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1222 1446 1362">18.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1362 1075 1468">c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1075 1362 1199 1468">21.9</td> <td data-bbox="1199 1362 1323 1468">28.3</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1362 1446 1468">22.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0.4	0.2	0.3	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	20.0	17.7	18.0	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	21.9	28.3	22.9	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior															
a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	0.4	0.2	0.3															
b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	20.0	17.7	18.0															
c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	21.9	28.3	22.9															

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	30.0	38.1	38.2																						
	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	27.7	15.7	20.5																						
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100%	99.90%																						
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 639 1480 1032"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Know their rights. (%)</td> <td>58</td> <td>56</td> <td>60</td> <td>-2.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)</td> <td>54</td> <td>51</td> <td>55</td> <td>-3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td> <td>75</td> <td>72</td> <td>78</td> <td>-3.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for this indicator from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the actual numbers used in the calculations for this indicator and to address the representativeness of its population in the parent survey response group that provided the data for this indicator. The State provided actual numbers from its calculations and included information in Appendices A and B on the representativeness of its response group.</p>						FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights. (%)	58	56	60	-2.00%	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	54	51	55	-3.00%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	75	72	78	-3.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																						
A. Know their rights. (%)	58	56	60	-2.00%																						
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs. (%)	54	51	55	-3.00%																						
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	75	72	78	-3.00%																						
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.08%. These data</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in</p>																				

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from FFY 2006 data of 1.08%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.3%.</p>	<p>performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and</p> <p>B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.44%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 2.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.10%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 63.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 of 29 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. The State required the six local early intervention service (EIS) programs with remaining noncompliance to participate in technical assistance in October 2008, submit revised/updated corrective action plans, and turn in monthly progress reports. The State reported that all remaining findings of noncompliance were subsequently corrected by March 2009.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data pertaining to compliance with requirements of this indicator for FFY 2005. Of the 19 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, 17 were corrected by June 2008, and a finding in one additional program was corrected in January 2009. The State required the remaining EIS program with the one uncorrected FFY 2005 finding to participate in a technical assistance call in 2008, to update/revise its corrective action plans, and to turn in monthly progress reports. The State reported that the EIS program may also be subject to focused monitoring, to have funds designated to assist in the compliance areas,</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it has not corrected remaining noncompliance from FFY 2005. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	and/or to intensive State supervision.	<p>report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>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:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.15%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 73.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of eleven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. The State required the one EIS program with remaining noncompliance to update/revise its corrective action plan and submit monthly progress reports.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance were corrected. The State reported that all remaining FFY 2005 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator were corrected by October 2008.</p>	<p>The State reported that it partially corrected its FFY 2006 and fully corrected its FFY 2005 findings regarding the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h).</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the one uncorrected FFY 2006 finding was corrected.</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>
<p>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: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State did not provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 89.34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 85.50%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%. The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that the one remaining finding of noncompliance was corrected in February, 2009. OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the uncorrected noncompliance it identified in FFY 2005 for this indicator was corrected. The State reported that all remaining FFY 2005 findings of</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFYs 2005 and 2006 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) were corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)), including correction</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>noncompliance related to this indicator were corrected by October 2008.</p>	<p>of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 28%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 55 of 66 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 11 findings of noncompliance were corrected by March, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 was corrected. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State reported 40 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, of which 12 findings were corrected in a timely manner. In the FFY 2007 APR, the</p>	<p>The State reported that remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>State reported that 26 of the 28 remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected by March 2009. The two remaining findings of noncompliance involved one local early intervention (EIS) program. This EIS program participated in a technical assistance call in October 2008. The State also conducted focused monitoring, required the program to update/revise its corrective action plans, and to turn in monthly progress reports.</p> <p>OSEP's March 24, 2008 verification letter concluded that OSEP was unable to determine whether two components of the State's Continuous Improvement Monitoring System or CIMS were reasonably designed to identify and correct noncompliance. In the FFY 2007 APR, the State confirmed it is using these CIMS components to identify and correct noncompliance.</p>	<p>corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501(b) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>
<p>10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due</p>	<p>The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the</p>

Michigan Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions were held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>