

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 94%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 of 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported that 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (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</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
		initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, 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). In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.				
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.2%. The State's data reflect a high level of performance for this indicator. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 95.8%.</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);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication);</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1398 1583 1468"> <tr> <td align="center"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></td> <td align="center"><u>FFY 2008</u></td> <td align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> <td align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u></td> </tr> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u>			

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]		<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>	FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	87.1	88.60	88.64	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.4	86.70	91.17	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	90.8	87.50	91.97	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	61.8	59.30	64.06	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	59.8	56.20	61.07	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	58.9	65.20	59.73	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets.				
	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	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data are:			

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children’s needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]</p>		<p align="center"><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></p>	<p align="center"><u>Progress</u></p>	
	<p>A. Know their rights (%)</p>	<p align="center">93.15</p>	<p align="center">97.78</p>	<p align="center">93.3</p>	<p align="center">4.63%</p>	
	<p>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs (%)</p>	<p align="center">95.31</p>	<p align="center">97.78</p>	<p align="center">95.3</p>	<p align="center">2.47%</p>	
	<p>C. Help their children develop and learn (%)</p>	<p align="center">95.27</p>	<p align="center">97.22</p>	<p align="center">93.9</p>	<p align="center">1.95%</p>	
	<p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met all of its FFY 2009 targets.</p>					
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data are 1.04%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of .99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 1.28%.</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data are 1.85%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.79%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 2.15%.</p>					<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 83.72%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 78.53%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%. The State reported that 18 of 24 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining six findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported that 24 findings of noncompliance</p>					<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.36%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 17 of 23 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining six findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011. The State reported that 23 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) and 20 U.S.C. 1436(a)(3) (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</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 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: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99.69%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.54%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (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 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 2010 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: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 85.46%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 81.18%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 16 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining four findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that 16 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100%</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (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 2010 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</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 81.91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 68.75%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 77 of 94 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the 17 remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported on page 49 of its APR that 30 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p>	<p>they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State timely corrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		In responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
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]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it received one signed written complaint during the reporting period that the complainant subsequently withdrew.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline. [Compliance Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
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). [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. The State is not required to meet targets or provide improvement activities until any fiscal year in which	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.

Oklahoma Part C FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	ten or more mediations were held.	
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.6%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>