How Local Service Area Determinations Were Established for Michigan Part C/ *Early On*

Under Section 616(a)(1)(C), 616(d), 642, and 34 CFR 303.700(a)(2) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*: Part C

Michigan Department of Lifelong Education, Advancement, and Potential

Office of Early Education

May 2026

MiLEAP
Michigan Department of Lifelong Education, Advancement, and Potential

How Local Service Area Determinations Were Established for Michigan Part C/*Early On*

Introduction

The Michigan Department of Lifelong Education, Advancement, and Potential Office of Early Education (MiLEAP OEE) used both results and compliance data in making a determination under Sections 616(a)(1)(C), 616(d), 642, and 34 CFR 303.700(a)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of the extent to which each local service area is meeting the purpose and requirements of Part C of the IDEA.

Information used as elements for calculating the determination score included: child outcomes data completeness reporting rates, and data from federal fiscal year (FFY) 2024 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the local service areas; and other data related to general supervision monitoring when applicable. Below is a detailed description of how the MiLEAP OEE evaluated the local service area data and how these data are reflected using the Determination Matrix. The MiLEAP OEE is using determinations criteria closely aligned to those used by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in making determinations for state Part C lead agencies.

The Determination Matrix consists of:

1. a **Results Matrix** that describes the scoring of the results element;
2. a **Compliance Matrix** that describes scoring based on the SPP/APR compliance indicators and the longstanding noncompliance element;
3. a table summarizing the **Results and Compliance Scoring** and reflecting performance percentages for both results and compliance;
4. the **Overall Determination Percentage** based on weighting of the results and compliance percentages; and
5. the **Determination Category** based on the local service area's overall performance percentage.

2026 Part C Results Matrix

Results Element

In making each local service area's 2026 determination, the MiLEAP OEE used child outcomes data completeness (i.e., reporting rates) to determine the results score. These data were collected within the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) and analyzed by Wayne State University.

Scoring Using the Results Matrix

The following scoring guide for data completeness was used to determine the results score by assigning 2, 1, or 0 points based on the following criteria:

- Two points: reporting rate percentage at least 65 percent[1]
- One point: reporting rate percentage is at least 34 percent and less than 65 percent
- Zero points: reporting rate percentage is less than 34 percent

2026 Part C Compliance Matrix

Compliance Elements

In making each local service area's 2026 determination, the MiLEAP OEE used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The local service area's FFY 2024 data for Part C compliance indicators 1, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c;
2. Longstanding noncompliance (uncorrected identified noncompliance only): findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 or earlier still not corrected as of February 1, 2026. Considered when scoring this element was noncompliance related to the IDEA Part C compliance indicators (1, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c).

Scoring Using the Compliance Matrix

The Compliance Matrix indicates a score of 2, 1, or 0 for each of the compliance indicators in item one above and for the additional element listed in item two.

[1] In determining the data completeness score, the MiLEAP OEE will round up from 64.5 percent (but no lower) to 65 percent. Similarly, the MiLEAP OEE will round up from 33.5 percent (but not lower) to 34 percent.

Compliance Indicators

- Two points: Data for each indicator were valid and reliable and reflect at least 95 percent[2] compliance; *or* the data for each indicator were valid and reliable, reflect at least 90 percent compliance *and* the local service area was issued one or more findings of noncompliance during FFY 2024 for the indicator and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance issued during FFY 2024 for the indicator.
- One point: Data for each indicator were valid and reliable and reflect at least 75 percent compliance, and the local service area did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.
- Zero points: Data for each indicator reflect less than 75 percent compliance; or data for the indicator were not valid or reliable; or no data were reported for the indicator.

Long Standing Noncompliance

Each local service area received points as follows for the Longstanding Noncompliance element (i.e., uncorrected for more than one year and not corrected as of February 1, 2026):

- Two points: No remaining findings of noncompliance issued in FFY 2022 or earlier.
- One point: Remaining findings of noncompliance issued in FFY 2022, FFY 2021, and/or FFY 2020 for which the local service area has not yet demonstrated full correction.
- Zero points: Remaining findings of noncompliance issued in FFY 2019 or earlier for which the local service area has not yet demonstrated full correction.

For the 2026 determination, every local service area will receive two points, as there are no remaining or open findings issued in FFY 2022 or earlier.

[2] In determining whether a local service area has met the compliance criterion for these indicators, the MiLEAP OEE will round up from 94.5 percent (but no lower) to 95 percent, round up from 89.5 percent (but no lower) to 90 percent and round up from 74.5 percent (but no lower) to 75 percent.

Results and Compliance Scoring

The Results and Compliance Scoring table summarizes the scores from the Results and Compliance Matrices and reflects a results percentage and a compliance percentage. Percentages are reported to the hundredths place.

The results percentage is derived from dividing the total actual points the local service area scored for the results element (numerator) by the total number of points possible for the results element (denominator) and then multiplying by 100.

The compliance percentage is derived from dividing the total actual points the local service area scored for compliance elements (numerator) by the total number of points possible for compliance elements (denominator) and then multiplying by 100.

2026 Overall Determination

Overall Determination Percentage

The 2026 overall determination percentage was calculated by weighting the results percentage by 30 percent and the compliance percentage by 70 percent. Weighting is being applied when calculating 2026 determinations due to having just one results element scored and six compliance elements scored.

Determination Categories

The calculated overall percentage was used to make the local service area's overall 2026 determination according to the following criteria:

Meets Requirements

A local service area's determination level is meets requirements if the overall percentage is at least 80 percent[3].

Needs Assistance

A local service area's determination level is needs assistance if the overall percentage is at least 60 percent but less than 80 percent.

[3] In determining whether a local service area meets the overall determination criterion, the MiLEAP OEE will round up from 79.5 percent (but no lower) to 80 percent, round up from 59.5 percent (but no lower) to 60 percent and round up from 39.5 percent (but no lower) to 40 percent.

Needs Intervention[4]

A local service area's determination level is needs intervention if the overall percentage is at least 40 percent but less than 60 percent.

Needs Substantial Intervention[4]

A local service area's determination level is needs substantial intervention if the overall percentage is at less than 40 percent.

[4] The MiLEAP OEE did not make a determination of needs intervention or needs substantial intervention for any local service area in 2026.