

District of Columbia Part C FFY 2012 SPP/APR Response Table

Part C SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. [Compliance Indicator]
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. [Results Indicator]
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 meet their needs. [Results Indicator]
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn. [Results Indicator]
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. [Results Indicator]
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday; [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and [Compliance Indicator]
8. Percent of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. [Compliance Indicator]
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]
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]
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
14. State-reported data (IDEA Section 618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

District of Columbia Part C FFY 2012 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET
2. Infants and Toddlers Served in Natural Environments	85.7%	96.1%	≥ 95% ¹
3. Early Childhood Outcomes Data	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	96.9%	92.6%	≥ 92.5%
A. Know their rights;			
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and	100%	94.1%	≥ 88%
C. Help their children develop and learn.	97.9%	96.1%	≥ 83%
5. Infants and Toddlers Served Birth to One	0.84%	0.55%	≥ 1.50%
6. Infants and Toddlers Served Birth to Three	2%	1.92%	≥ 3.0%
12. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	None	None	Not Applicable
13. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	None	None	Not Applicable

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

3. Percent of Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

Summary Statement 1²	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	74.8%	58.2%	≥ 75.2%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	73.6%	62.6%	≥ 71.6%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	77.4%	67.7%	≥ 80.2%
Summary Statement 2³	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2012 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	68.1%	55.5%	≥ 31.6%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.1%	49.8%	≥ 35.9%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	57.9%	60.4%	≥ 44.4%

² **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 3 years of age or exited the program.

³ **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

District of Columbia FFY 2012 Results Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 3:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

INDICATOR 12: The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

INDICATOR 13: The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

District of Columbia Part C FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
1. Timely provision of early intervention services	84.6%	88.9%	100%	The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.
7. 45-day timeline for evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting	98.9%	92.3%	100%	The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.
8. A. IFSPs with transition steps and services	96.4%	82.7%	100%	The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.
8. B. Notification to LEA and SEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	96.1%	100%	100%	The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.
8. C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	90%	95.6%	100%	The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.
9. Timely correction	60%	100%	100%	The State reported that all 22 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner.
14. Timely and accurate data	100%	98.4%	100%	

District of Columbia Part C FFY 2012 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.	No State complaints received in reporting period.
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.	No due process hearings received during reporting period.

District of Columbia FFY 2012 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 1: The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.

The State was identified as being in need of assistance for three consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2012 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that any noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, and each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.⁴ In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

⁴ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance: (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 or provider.

INDICATOR 7: The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.

The State was identified as being in need of assistance for three consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2012 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2013 APR that any noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012, and each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 8A:

The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.

The State was identified as being in need of assistance for three consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2012 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the remaining 10 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 8B: The required measurement for Indicator 8B, effective for reporting on FFY 2012, is: “Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.” (Emphasis added.) The State provided information under its FFY 2012 APR Indicator 8B which OSEP understands to indicate that the State’s data for this indicator are based on notification to both the SEA and LEA, as required by the measurement. The data table submitted by the State reflects an inadvertent error in OSEP’s optional template (line “a” in the data table references notification only to the LEA and not also to the SEA), and OSEP understands that error in the data table in the State’s FFY 2012 Indicator 8B to be the result of the error in OSEP’s template.

The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that any uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 8C: The State did not report in this indicator on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the five uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (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 or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 9: The State was identified as being in need of assistance for three consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2009, FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2012 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

INDICATOR 14: The State's FFY 2012 data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP recalculated the data for this indicator to be 98.4%.

OTHER COMPLIANCE ISSUES:

Department-wide Special Conditions: Special Conditions have been imposed on all grants awarded to the State by the Department for FFYs 2006 through FFY 2013 due to problems with the State's fiscal and program accountability, management systems, and related areas.