



**State Interagency
Coordinating
Council**

March 2008

**FY 2008
Report
To the
Legislature**

**As required by
Minn. Stat. 125A.28**

COMMISSIONER:

Alice Seagren

**State
Interagency
Coordinating
Council**

March 2008

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen Carlson

Minnesota Department of Education

T: (651) 582-8397

E-MAIL: karen.carlson@state.mn.us

**FY 2008
Report
To the
Legislature**

**As required
by
Minn. Stat.
125A.28**

1500 Highway 36 West

Roseville, MN 55113-4266

TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8201

Upon request, this report can be made available in alternative formats.

ESTIMATED COST OF PREPARING THIS REPORT

This report provides information which is maintained and published as Minnesota Rules by the Office of Revisor of Statutes as a part of its normal business functions. Therefore, the cost information reported below does not include the cost of gathering the data but rather is limited to the estimated cost of actually preparing this report document.

Special funding was not appropriated for the costs of preparing this report.

The estimated cost incurred by the Minnesota Department of Education in preparing this report is \$400.

Interagency Coordinating Council Report to the Governor

Minnesota Part C Annual Performance Report Summary FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)



February 2008

Minnesota Part C Annual Performance Report FFY 2006 (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

Executive Summary

Background

State accountability for student performance has gained increased attention over the past several years. Indeed, the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 includes a number of educational standards and provisions requiring states and local school districts to report on the learning outcomes of all students. One new requirement is that states must develop a comprehensive plan to evaluate the implementation of services for infants and toddlers with disabilities (also known as Part C services).

In alignment with IDEA, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has identified four monitoring priorities and 14 indicators (see below) by which states can measure the effectiveness of their Part C services. For each of the indicators, states are required to identify how they will meet measurable and rigorous targets and specify improvement activities over a six-year period in the *State Performance Plan (SPP)* found at <http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/groups/Compliance/documents/Report/033647.pdf>. The targets are either compliance targets which are set by OSEP (100% or 0%) or performance targets which are set by the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) in conjunction with the lead agency for Part C, the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). States must also report on their actual progress within each indicator in the *Annual Performance Report (APR)* due February 1 each year.

The following report is a summary of the Minnesota Part C 2006 Annual Performance Report (APR). The complete, unedited version of the Minnesota APR can be accessed at the MDE website at <http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/groups/Compliance/documents/Report/033647.pdf>.

Please note that trend data is provided for each indicator when it is available in order to provide information on improvement in Minnesota's Part C program.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

The Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) worked closely with staff from the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) in the development of the APR. A subcommittee was formed to work with department staff in the development of the APR including discussion of the data, giving meaning to the results, and addressing areas of strength as well as areas of concern. At the January 2008 ICC meeting, the following steps were taken:

- Data was shared for each indicator,
- Activities were reviewed,
- Progress/slippage was discussed and
- Recommendations were made by the full ICC membership for the continued inclusion of the APR in the priorities of the ICC.

An overview of the APR data was also presented to a statewide coalition of advocates for discussion and feedback prior to the submission of the APR.

Data included in the APR came from three sources: (1) the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS), (2) Minnesota's 618 data submitted during the reporting year, and (3) the newly

developed ECSE Outcomes online data system that allowed MDE to collect data for indicators 1, 3, 7 and 8 for all applicable children served under Part C.

The Department also posts the performance of local educational agencies (LEAs/early intervention program sites) on its web site each year. The information reported on these profiles provides awareness of local performance and a comparative reference point. The District Data Profiles are a visible incentive to LEAs to build capacity to serve children effectively in natural environments. MDE monitoring staff use the data included in the ECSE District Data Profiles in preparation for on-site monitoring visits. Data are not reported to the public in instances where cell sizes are small and the publication of the data would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children or where the data is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information. Many of the state's LEAs serve a small population and it is not possible to report the data. In these instances, reporting of data will be done jointly with other LEAs in larger administrative units, such as special education cooperatives. The data profiles will be posted in March 2008, and training will be provided for LEA staff on accessing and utilizing their data in program improvement in March and April 2008.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2006 Performance
90.4%	91% ¹	100% ²	98.8%

In order to ensure that the needs of children with disabilities are being met, it is important that those eligible for Part C receive the services within a timely manner. The ICC defines "timely" as being not more than 30 calendar days after the initial IFSP team meeting.

In prior years, Minnesota's APR data for this indicator reported the timeliness of the initial services on the child's *initial IFSP only*. Therefore, it is not possible to compare the 2006 data with the data from previous years.

The data was collected using a specially developed online system for Indicators 1, 3, 7 and 8. All children served in Part C during the reporting period were included in the system. LEAs reported the timeliness of all new services on all IFSPs for children who were in Part C during the reporting period. This data is now part of the state's general supervision system and is integrated into monitoring systems at the state and local levels.

The FFY 2006 data indicates a 'substantial degree of compliance' as defined by OSEP as 95% or higher.

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings.

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2006 Performance
89.2%	90.3%	90.0% ³	92.3%

¹ The data submitted before FFY 2006 was not complete and is not useful in making year-to-year comparisons.

² Compliance Target of 100% set by OSEP.

Part C promotes the delivery of early intervention services in environments that are natural for young children and their families. Natural environments in Minnesota include the home and community-based programs where infants and toddlers without disabilities typically spend their day.

Minnesota demonstrated progress on this indicator by exceeding the established target and continues a three year performance trend of serving a growing percentage of eligible infants and toddlers in natural environments. Several factors contribute to improved performance.

Several initiatives supported by MDE relate directly or indirectly to improving state performance on this indicator. Throughout FFYs 2006 and 2007, the Center for Inclusive Child Care (CICC), supported by MDE and the Department of Human Services (DHS), has worked to build capacity among child care providers throughout Minnesota to effectively include infants, toddlers and preschool children with disabilities in child care centers and family child care homes. The CICC provided online and face-to-face training opportunities on multiple topics of importance to child care providers. These training activities are provided in multiple languages in order to meet the needs of child care providers who speak languages other than English. For example, a video and CD on child development and access to Part C services that targeted the Somali population was developed and disseminated. The CICC maintains a directory of certified trainers and consultants in many content areas and hosts a dynamic website that has become an important state resource. See <http://www.inclusivechildcare.org/> for resources available from CICC.

In 2005, Minnesota was selected to participate as a dissemination site by the National Individualizing Preschool Inclusion Project. The State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is funding greater dissemination of the project from 2005 onward. The FFY 2006 activities included providing modular trainings on specific topics such as Routines-Based Interview, Integrated Therapy and Embedded Intervention to selected LEAs. In addition, LEAs not specifically targeted in the SPDG have received technical assistance in Routines-Based Interviews, Functional Goal Writing and the Primary Service Provider Model from MDE staff and workshops supported by MDE. These efforts have helped support an understanding of the components necessary for the successful delivery of early intervention services in natural environments and have helped local early intervention staff begin building statewide capacity.

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication);**
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (i.e., adaptive behaviors)**

Progress Data⁴ for FFY 2006 (2006-2007):

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	1.42
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	99	28.13

³ Performance target set by ICC and MDE.

⁴ Progress data reported in 2010 will be considered baseline data for purposes of the State Performance Plan. Targets will be established at that time.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach level of same-age peers	94	26.70
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	72	20.45
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	82	23.30
Total	N= 352	100%

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language and communication skills)	Number of Children	Percent of Children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	1.42
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	89	25.21
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach level of same-age peers	121	34.28
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	74	20.96
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	64	18.13
Total	N= 353	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	Percent of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	4	1.14
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	72	20.57
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach level of same-age peers	72	20.57
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	86	24.57
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	116	33.14
Total	N=350	100%

Although progress data was available on 356 infants and toddlers this year, the proportions of children in each of the five progress categories may not be representative of the developmental progress attainable by all children participating in Minnesota's Part C program. The length of program participation for infants and toddlers included in this first set of progress data ranged from 6 to 15 months. The majority of the children in this data set entered early intervention between 21 and 30 months of age. Most of the children who have entry data and entered the ECSE program as infants are still participating in the program and will not exit early intervention services until the 2008-2009 reporting

year. Speech/Language Impairment is the reported primary disability category for 37% of children included in this progress data set while being designated as the primary disability for only 12.6% of children served on 12/1/06.

Progress data reported in 2010 will be considered baseline data for purposes of the State Performance Plan. Targets will be established at that time.

In response to federal outcome reporting requirements and to improve interventions for young children with disabilities, Minnesota has implemented an outcome reporting system to measure the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills; acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The procedures put into place throughout the state are based extensively on the work of and recommendations made by the federally funded Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO).

While MDE strongly encourages districts to frequently assess child progress and use that ongoing assessment data to inform intervention strategies, MDE only requires the reporting of that data at entrance into and exit from Part C for infants and toddlers with disabilities.

To support LEAs in the purchase of necessary assessment tools or to secure training on the appropriate use of tools, an additional \$15 per child ages 3-5 from the 12/1/05 child count was appropriated from 619 discretionary funds during Fiscal Year 06. Districts were given the discretion to use any criterion-referenced or curriculum-based assessment measure that has been cross-walked by ECO as the foundational element for child outcome progress measurement. In addition, MDE sponsored trainings on several cross-walked assessment tools during the reporting year to support appropriate use of tools by IFSP team members.

Great effort has been made to build statewide capacity by providing ongoing training and technical assistance in order to ensure that LEAs collect and report data that is both valid and reliable. The Information Technologies Division within MDE has worked to develop and implement a web-based data collection application.

Indicator 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 child's needs;**
- C. Help their children develop and learn**

Family Outcomes	FFY 2005 Baseline	FFY 2006 Targets⁵	FFY 2006 Performance
A. Know their rights	74.2%	75%	75%
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	82.1%	83%	87%
C. Help their children develop and learn	86.8%	87%	90%

A total of 1,935 children exited Minnesota's early intervention service system between July 1, 2006, and June 30, 2007, after participating for six months or more. Included are children who exited because they turned 3, met their IFSP goals, were withdrawn early by their parents or who moved out of the state. The ECO Family Outcome Survey was hand-delivered to families upon exit by their service coordinator or primary service provider. Each survey was

⁵ Performance targets set by ICC and MDE.

accompanied by an envelope affixed with proper postage addressed to MDE. A total of 677 surveys were returned by 35% of potential respondent families.

Minnesota’s statewide performance on each specific family outcome demonstrated an improvement over the baseline data. The targets established by the ICC for all three family outcomes were met and the targets for 4 B (effectively communicating their children’s needs) and 4 C (help their children develop and learn) were exceeded.

The implementation of several key initiatives contributed to commendable performance on the three family outcomes.

- MDE contracted with the Minnesota Association of Children’s Mental Health (MACMH) to improve family-driven assessment for each child identified under Part C and to improve the ability of the IFSP team to incorporate family-identified priorities into the IFSP and appropriately measure those outcomes. MACMH developed a training curriculum and provided five face-to-face trainings during FFY 2007.
- PACER Center, as part of Minnesota’s SPDG, conducted regional trainings to increase cultural competency among early interventionists.
- Through the Minnesota Individualizing Preschool Inclusion Project, MDE has promoted use of the Routines-Based Interview process and the primary service provider model of intervention.
- The Family Outcome Survey has been translated into Arabic, Cambodian, Croatian, Hmong, Laotian, Simplified Chinese, Oromo, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese to facilitate the receipt of responses from families who are non-English speakers.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision for Part C/ Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to one year of age with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other states with similar eligibility definitions;**
- B. National data**

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target⁶	FFY 2006 Performance
0.41%	0.46%	0.55%	0.63%

- A. Minnesota served .63% compared to a range of .60 – 2.00% for other states with moderate eligibility definitions.
- B. Minnesota served .63% compared to the national average of 1.06% with a range of .45 – 2.90%, not including states that serve an at-risk population.

This indicator, along with Indicator 6, represents a major area of focus in the reporting period during which the Department embarked on a rule-making process to change Minnesota’s eligibility criteria for its Part C program. Building upon the findings of OSEP’s verification visit in 2004 and the recommendations of the ICC as well as a broader statewide stakeholder group convened in the last reporting period, the Department established new eligibility criteria, evaluation requirements and transition requirements in its new rule, Minnesota Rule 1325.1350. During the reporting period, state staff held a series of public forums for local staff and advocacy partners throughout the state and met regularly with the state’s special education directors and early childhood special education coordinators in order to inform them of the new criteria and related requirements and answer any questions related to these changes. In addition, the changes were sent out to directors, coordinators and local

⁶ Performance target set by ICC and MDE.

Interagency Early Intervention Committee chairs as well as interagency partner agencies in order to inform everyone of the new criteria. State staff also provided technical assistance and on-site training throughout the state to facilitate implementation of the new criteria. The substantial boost in child count, surpassing the state's target of .55%, is the result of this coordinated effort to inform local agencies of the change in criteria.

In addition, LEAs were required to develop an action plan to improve their child find efforts as part of the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process: Self Review (MNCIMP:SR) if their child count rates fell below the state's target. Similarly, as part of the local Interagency Early Intervention Committee's annual plan application, each committee was required to address its child count and develop a similar action plan if the local rate was below the state average. These local efforts, combined with the new criteria, have resulted in a dramatic increase in the percent of infants under age one receiving services.

An interagency work group made up of state staff from Education, Health and Human Services met regularly throughout the year to develop a comprehensive website to assist local staff in making eligibility determinations regarding conditions that have a high probability of resulting in developmental delay. Specific conditions were researched and findings were presented to the ICC for inclusion in the list of eligible conditions. The work group also developed guidance materials for local staff to use when determining eligibility for conditions not listed.

An innovative effort in public awareness and outreach was initiated by the Department in May 2007 with the development of an interactive parenting website. MNParentsKnow.info offers Minnesota parents a convenient source for trusted information beginning at birth on their child's learning, development, health and safety. The website was developed using extensive research and parent input through the Minnesota Department of Education in collaboration with the Department of Health, Department of Human Services, University of Minnesota, Tufts University, Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota and many other leading organizations in the field of early childhood health and education.

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

A. Other states with similar eligibility definitions;

B. National data

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target ⁷	FFY 2006 Performance
1.50%	1.56%	1.70%	1.70%

Minnesota served 1.70% of the general population of infants under age 1 based upon the December 1, 2006 child count.

- A. Minnesota served 1.70% compared to a range of 1.36 – 4.39% for other States with moderate eligibility definitions.
- B. Minnesota served 1.70% compared to an average of 2.43% nationally. The national range is 1.21 – 6.16%, not including states that serve an at risk population.

See discussion under Indicator 5 for a summary of efforts impacting performance on this Indicator.

⁷ Performance target set by ICC and MDE.

Indicator 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

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target⁸	FFY 2006 Performance
79.5%	83.4%	100%	86.3%

86.3% = [2348 timely + 512 untimely for family reasons] / 3316 * 100

Minnesota is made up of 96 local Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs), which are responsible for implementing referral processes and procedures to identify infants and toddlers with disabilities in their local area. The IEICs must complete the identification process within 45 calendar days after the referral. Local school districts are required to report on the timeliness of each Part C evaluation, as well as to identify reasons why any evaluation is late. The current data reflects steady improvement over the last three years, although it does not reach the compliance target of 100%. A total of 3,316 evaluations resulted in eligibility determinations between July 1, 2006, and June 30, 2007. Of these, 2,348 were completed within the 45 day regulatory timeframe. Of the 968 untimely evaluations, 456 were for systems-related reasons and 512 were attributed to exceptional family or child circumstances.

The systemic reasons for untimeliness can be broken down into the following categories (please note that this is not an unduplicated count, several reasons could be reported for the same instance of untimeliness):

- 151 were due to difficulty in coordinating the schedules of members of the evaluation team,
- 126 were referrals received just prior to a break in instruction (holiday breaks),
- 93 were referrals received in the summer months,
- 47 resulted from a communication delay from the interagency central point of intake in the community, and
- the remainder were due to staffing issues.

MDE has provided technical assistance and training on the requirement to meet the 45-day timeline *year-round*, emphasizing that breaks in the school calendar year are not acceptable in Part C. A listserv among the early childhood special education coordinators in the state has been a vehicle for sharing effective strategies that local areas and LEAs are using to meet the timeline requirements. In addition, the data from this indicator is integrated into each self review monitoring annual report in the MNCIMP:SR system and LEAs must develop an action plan if not at 100% compliance. Since many of the systemic reasons involved the timely communication of the initial referral from the interagency central point of intake, every local Interagency Early Intervention Committee is also required to review their local performance in this indicator and must develop an action plan to improve timely referrals as part of their annual application for Part C funds if they are not at 100% compliance. These coordinated efforts should help to ensure the timely communication of referrals to the LEA.

⁸ Compliance target set by OSEP.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision for Part C/ Effective Transition

Indicator 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:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;**
- B. Notification to LEA, if the child is potentially eligible for Part B;**
- C. Transition conference, if the child is potentially eligible for Part B**

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Targets⁹	FFY 2006 Performance
A. 100% ¹⁰	A. 80%	A. 100%	A. 87%
B. 100%	B. 100%	B. 100%	B. 100%
C. NA ¹¹	C. 30%	C. 100%	C. 50%

Numerous conversations were held between MDE and OSEP monitoring staff in the summer and fall of 2007 in order to clarify the state’s transition policy. As a result, the transition requirements under IDEA have become very clear and state guidance has been developed and disseminated at statewide meetings of directors of special education (October 2007), early childhood special education coordinators (October 2007) and at regional and local meetings of early childhood staff (October 2007 to the present time).

MDE has analyzed the data by LEA for Indicator 8 and has taken steps to ensure compliance in the future in conjunction with the Governor’s Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC).

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision for Part C/ General Supervision

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

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target¹²	FFY 2006 Performance
NA ¹³	91.3%	100%	96.6%

⁹ Compliance targets set by OSEP.

¹⁰ Data for this Indicator was taken from monitoring for FFY 2004 and is not comparable that from subsequent years.

¹¹ Data for this Indicator was not available for FFY 2004.

¹² Compliance target set by OSEP.

¹³ The reporting requirements for Indicator 9 have changed and it is not feasible to compare data from FFY 2004 to subsequent years.

In comparing the revised data from the FFY 2005 APR to the current data, the percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification has increased from 91.3% to 96.6%, an overall improvement of 5.3%. As discussed in the FFY 2005 APR, MDE did not have a system in place for tracking individual record noncompliance and correction prior to 2006. The data reported in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 were based on the corrected non-compliance of previously identified systemic non-compliance and as a result, the data available for the indicator did not completely address the measurement for this indicator. Data regarding the continued presence of non-compliance found in a LEA on a second review indicated whether or not the LEA had adequately addressed the issue of systemic non-compliance. However, the data did not address individual child record non-compliance and whether that non-compliance was corrected. Since that time MDE has adjusted the Access Monitoring Database to collect and identify the correction of individual child record non-compliance and has worked extensively with LEAs on addressing the correction of identified individual child record non-compliance. MDE is confident that the data available for FFY 2007 will reflect the correction of non-compliance identified in 2006-07.

Several of the Improvement Activities reported in the FFY 2005 APR have been completed; allowing for more complete data collection:

- Revise the process for selecting records for monitoring purposes.
- Improve the identification of non-compliance.
- Create database of compliance standards.
- Proceduralize the correction of non-systemic non-compliance. MDE has established a tracking system spreadsheet to track the correction of individual record non-compliance.
- Develop and use electronic database to track hearings including, but not limited to: timelines, findings, corrective action required.
- Establish a system to send follow-up letters at 6 months and 12 months to LEAs where non-compliance was found to request status of corrective action and evidence of completion of order.

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target¹⁴	FFY 2006 Performance
100%	100%	100%	100%

(1) Signed, written complaints total	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	1
(a) Reports with findings	0
(b) Reports within timeline	0
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0

¹⁴ Compliance target set by OSEP.

(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

In FFY 2006, MDE received one Part C complaint and issued a report on this complaint. No complaints were withdrawn or dismissed without any written report. Please note that MDE considers any complaint with a report issued, regardless of whether wrongdoing on the part of the district was found, as a “report with findings.”

Indicator 11: Percent of due process hearing requests fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target ¹⁵	FFY 2006 Performance
No hearing requests	No hearing requests	100%	No hearing requests

There were no Part C hearing requests or hearings in the reporting period.

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted)

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target ¹⁶	FFY 2006 Performance
No hearing requests	No hearing requests	NA	No hearing requests

Because there were no hearing requests for Part C in 2006, there were no resolution sessions.

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target ¹⁷	FFY 2006 Performance
No mediation requests	No mediation requests	100%	No mediation requests

MDE had no Part C mediation requests in the reporting period.

¹⁵ Compliance target set by OSEP.

¹⁶ No targets have been set since there have not been any Part C hearing requests in FFYs 2004 – 2006.

¹⁷ Compliance target set by OSEP.

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate

Baseline FFY 2004	FFY 2005	FFY 2006 Target¹⁸	FFY 2006 Performance
NA	NA	100%	A. 100% B. 98%

Actual Target Data for 2006:

- A. 100% of the state reported data, including 618 data, state performance plan and annual performance report, was submitted on or before due dates.
- B. 98% of Minnesota's data is accurate.

MDE has worked during the reporting year to greatly improve the validity and reliability of data used to measure Minnesota's performance on the SPP/APR. Review of data submitted by LEAs demonstrates the effectiveness of those efforts. Written guidance posted on the MDE website as well as face-to-face training provided at LEA request has served to enhance the accuracy of LEA data submitted through the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS).

A joint training model was developed and implemented for ECSE service providers and MARSS reporters during the prior reported year and continued in this reporting period. This training effectively focused on those data components that require active communication to ensure accurate reporting. This training was provided in each economic development region of Minnesota.

During the reporting year MDE developed and successfully initiated the ECSE Outcomes data site. This data collection tool was developed specifically for the purpose of gathering information necessary to respond to the Child Outcome Indicators in Parts C and B as well as collecting additional data necessary to respond completely and accurately to other selected indicators. Face-to-face training was conducted prior to implementation. Written guidance materials were provided and responsive technical assistance was available during the system's initial submission period. An additional benefit of the new system was the extent to which it provided LEAs a final opportunity to review and correct reporting errors. Each submission was subjected to programmed data validation and verification checks and was reviewed by program staff.

Publicly reporting local performance data has continued to emphasize the importance of the data accuracy.

¹⁸ Compliance target set by OSEP.