

MISSOURI – PART C

Table B

Previously Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 1 34 CFR §§ 303.342(e), 303.344(f)(1) and 303.340(c)</p> <p>OSEP’s October 2004 letter directed the State to submit data in the FFY 2003 APR regarding whether all services identified on the IFSPs were provided as required by Part C.</p> <p>OSEP’s October 27, 2005 letter indicated that OSEP could not determine, from the data the State submitted, the causes for the delays or denials of the early intervention services on IFSPs and required the State to provide, in the SPP, updated data in response to Indicator 1 regarding the percent of eligible children who receive their early intervention services in a timely manner, and, if the data indicated noncompliance, a plan to ensure compliance within one year of OSEP’s acceptance of the plan.</p>	<p>On page 4 of the SPP, the State reported data indicating that 69.7% of children received all of the services listed on their IFSPs within 30 days from the authorization start date.</p> <p>On page 5 of the SPP, the State submitted improvement activities, timelines and resources for ensuring that eligible children receive the early intervention services listed on their IFSPs.</p>	<p>The State provided data that demonstrate noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) that eligible children receive all of the early intervention services listed on their IFSPs. The level of compliance reported was 69.7%.</p>	<p>The State must review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>See Table A for issues identified in the SPP also relating to this indicator.</p>

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 7 34 CFR §§ 303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a)</p> <p>OSEP's March 20, 2003 response to the State's 2002 Self-Assessment identified noncompliance with the requirement to complete evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral. In its May 7, 2004 letter responding to the State's FFY 2001 APR, OSEP accepted the State's strategies for correcting this noncompliance and required the State to provide a final Progress Report by June 6, 2005.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2003 APR reported baseline and trend data for the 45-day timeline that indicated continued noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's October 2005 response to the APR required the State to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide updated correction data regarding the percentage of eligible children who received an assessment, evaluation and an initial IFSP meeting within 45 days of referral, broken down by single point of entry (SPOE), covering the period from January 2005 through the most recent data available. OSEP further stated that, if the data were available, Missouri must also provide the reasons for delays, broken down by SPOE; and 2. Ensure that its targets for Indicator 7 and other compliance indicators were 100%. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State reported on page 19 of the SPP, baseline data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) indicating that 75.4% of eligible children had an evaluation, assessment, and initial IFSP completed within the 45-day timeline or that exceeded the timeline due to parent or child reasons. <p>On page 20 of the SPP, the State provided a chart organized by SPOE region for the time period from January 1, 2005 to August 31, 2005 indicating that 81.52% of the 45-day timelines either were met or exceeded for family reasons.</p> <p>On page 21 of the SPP, the State provided a similar chart that reported the reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline. The reasons cited for delays were: Parent/Child (26.7%); SPOE (5.3%); Provider (11.2%); Provider Availability (3.2%); and No Reason (48.1%).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. On page 22, the State included 100% compliance targets for Indicator 7. The State also reported 100% compliance as the target for all other SPP compliance indicators. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State provided data that demonstrate continuing noncompliance with the requirement regarding Part C's 45-day timeline at 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). The level of compliance reported in the baseline data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) was 75.4%, and 81.52% for the time period from January 1, 2005 to August 31, 2005. <p>OSEP initially identified this noncompliance in its March 2003 letter and required correction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The State provided information reporting 100% compliance as the target for all SPP compliance indicators. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with this requirement by June 1, 2006. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may result in the State being identified as a "high risk" grantee or otherwise affect the State's FFY 2006 grant award. 2. No further action is required.

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p>Indicator 8C 34 CFR § 303.148(b)(2)(i)</p> <p>OSEP's October 2004 letter directed the State to submit data regarding whether the State was meeting the transition planning conference requirements of 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i), and if the data showed noncompliance, a plan to ensure correction of the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP's October 27, 2005 letter found that the State's FFY 2003 APR data did not measure compliance with the transition planning conference requirement. OSEP's letter required the State to provide, in the SPP, updated data in response to Indicator 8 regarding compliance with the transition planning conference requirement, and if the data indicated noncompliance, a plan designed to ensure compliance within one year of OSEP's acceptance of the plan.</p>	<p>The State reported on page 24 of the SPP, data indicating that 46.4% of children potentially eligible for Part B had a transition conference.</p> <p>On pages 24 and 25 of the SPP, the State submitted improvement activities, timelines and resources for ensuring that the timely transition planning requirements, including the planning conference, are met.</p>	<p>1. The State provided data that demonstrate noncompliance with the transition planning conference requirements of 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (Indicator 8C). The level of compliance reported was 46.4%.</p> <p>2. See Table A for issues in the SPP relating to Indicator 8A and Indicator 8B.</p>	<p>1. The State must review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>2. As discussed in Table A.</p>
<p>Indicator 9 34 CFR § 303.501</p> <p>In its March 2003 letter, OSEP indicated that the State was not ensuring timely correction of identified noncompliance. In its May 7, 2004 verification visit letter, OSEP found that the State's noncompliance in this area had persisted. In its May 7, 2004 response to the State's FFY 2001 APR, OSEP accepted the State's improvement strategies and directed the State to submit a final Progress Report by June 6, 2005.</p> <p>OSEP's October 27, 2005 response to the State's FFY 2003 APR found that the FFY 2003 APR and June 2005 Progress Report data did not confirm that the State corrected the identified noncompliance within one year of identification. OSEP's letter required the State to provide, in response to Indicator 9 in the SPP, data and analysis demonstrating the correction of State-identified noncompliance within one year of identification, which OSEP indicated must be the date of the monitoring report or other mechanism used by the State to inform its local programs of noncompliance.</p>	<p>Indicator 9A: On page 29 of the SPP, the State reported data indicating that 60% of identified noncompliance was corrected within the one-year timeline for monitoring priority areas and indicators.</p> <p>Indicator 9B: On page 30 of the SPP, the State reported data indicating that, for areas not related to monitoring priority areas and indicators, 88.3% of noncompliance was corrected within one year.</p>	<p>The State provided data that demonstrate continuing noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §303.501, that the State ensure correction of identified noncompliance within one year of the date it identifies the noncompliance.</p> <p>Indicator 9A: The level of compliance reported was 60% for monitoring priority areas and indicators.</p> <p>Indicator 9B: The level of compliance reported was 88.3% for areas not related to monitoring priority areas.</p> <p>OSEP initially identified this noncompliance in its March 2003 letter responding to the State's 2002 Self-Assessment and required correction.</p>	<p>The State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with these requirements by June 1, 2006. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may result in the State being identified as a "high risk" grantee or otherwise affect the State's FFY 2006 grant award.</p>