

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 94.41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 82.79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 of 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report that it verified that each early intervention service (EIS) program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1); and (2) has completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR due February 1, 2011, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the 24 noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are 99.86%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 95.81%.</p>	<p>The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments are at or greater than 95%. There is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and assumes that the State is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance with 34 CFR §§303.12, 303.18, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii).</p>
<p>3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps	
meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²			
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	87.1	61.8			
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	89.4	59.8			
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	90.8	58.9			
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]	The State's reported data for this indicator are:				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	
		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Progress
	A. Know their rights (%)	98.72	96.45 (93.15)	93.15		-2.26%
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs (%)	96.48	93.31 (95.31)	92.25		-3.17%
	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	98.40	95.27	93.85		-3.13%
	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for indicator 4A are 93.15% and for 4B are					

¹ Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>95.31%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for Indicator 4A to be 96.45% and for Indicator 4B to be 93.31%. The recalculated data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 98.72% for 4A and 96.48% for 4B. These data also represent slippage for 4C from the FFY 2007 data. The State met all of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for these indicators were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State included improvement activities to address this issue in the future.</p>	
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are .99%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 1.17%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 1.26%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.79%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 1.90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 2.15%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.53%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 78.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a); and (2) has completed the required action, although late, unless the</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100%</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the State must also demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the 24 noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.36%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 88.15%. The State did not meet its</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 23 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>However, the State did not report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the 23 noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator, and noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
<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>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97.12%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>However, the State did not report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the seven noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 81.18%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 97.12%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that five of 16 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)); and (2) has completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance 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)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2009 APR that the 16 noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator and noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 68.75%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 66 of 96 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; or (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the</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 2009 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP Memo</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	jurisdiction of the EIS program.	<p>09-02, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and the OSEP Memo 09-02 was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on two complaints. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §303.512.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 2008 reporting period.</p> <p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 2008 reporting period.</p> <p>The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 98.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>