

State X Timely Services Data - C1

Background

- State X is a moderately populated state that served approximately 5,100 Part C eligible children on December 1, 2008.
- There are 10 regional early intervention programs statewide.
- Each regional program is responsible for providing evaluation and assessment to determine eligibility, developing the initial IFSP, providing initial and ongoing service coordination, and either providing and/or coordinating the provision of early intervention services to children and families in accordance with an IFSP.
- The state has 2 major metropolitan areas (served by regions 2 and 7).
- Five (5) regions serve a mixture of urban and rural areas (regions 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10).
- Three (3) regions (regions 1, 3, and 6) serve primarily rural areas.
- Except for the 2 major metropolitan areas, the geographic areas served by the regional programs are relatively large impacting travel time for service provision.
- For the most part, the regional programs in more rural areas provide the services due to lack of other available community providers.
- Regional programs in more populated areas have developed relationships with existing community providers and as a result, children residing in metropolitan areas or more suburban areas frequently receive their IFSP services through service provider agencies or independent providers rather than through the regional programs.

State's Timely Services Definition

State X has defined timely services as 30 days from the date the IFSP is signed by the parent.

State Data

FFY 2008 (July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008) data for this indicator is based upon a review of a random selection of children's records of children being served during December 2008. Statewide timely services data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Timely Services Data

Children Receiving Timely Services	Children with Delays due to Exceptional Family Circumstances	Total Children with Timely Services + Children with Delays due to Exceptional Family Circumstances	Children with Delayed Services
79%(323/408)	10%(40/408)	89%(363/408)	11%(45/408)

For those children statewide who experienced a delay in the provision of timely services, the following table demonstrates the number of days beyond the 30 day time line that services were delayed.

Table 2: Percent of Children Who's Services were Delayed by Number of Days

Range of Days	% of Children Who's Services were Delayed within Range of Days
31 - 60 Days	73% (33/45)
61 - 90 Days	27% (10/45)
91 - 120 Days	9% (2/45)
120 Days & Beyond	0

Table 3 reflects the early intervention services that were most frequently delayed.

Table 3: Percent of Service Delay by Service

Service	Service Delay Percent
Special Instruction	30%
Physical Therapy	14%
Speech Pathology	47%
Other	9%

The following table identifies the number of children who had one or more services delayed based on the total number of services on the child's IFSP. For example, 15 children had 1 of 3 services on their IFSP delayed, while only 4 children had 2 of 3 IFSP services delayed.

Table 4: Children by Frequency of Services Delayed on Their IFSP

Number of Children	Number of Services Delayed	Total Number of Services Per Child's IFSP
6	1	1
11	1	2
15	1	3
4	2	3
3	1	4
3	3	5
3	4	5

Regional Program Data

Table 5 summarizes each regional program's performance on the provision of timely services.

Table 5: Regional Program’s Timely Services Data

Regions	Children with Timely Services (including Children with Delays due to Exceptional Family Circumstances)	Delay in Services
Region 1	80% (20/25)	20% (5/25)
Region 2	79% (52/66)	21% (14/66)
Region 3	100% (27/27)	0% (0/27)
Region 4	85% (38/45)	15% (7/45)
Region 5	87% (35/39)	13% (4/39)
Region 6	96% (25/26)	4% (1/26)
Region 7	81% (48/59)	19% (11/59)
Region 8	96% (52/54)	4% (2/54)
Region 9	100% (36/36)	0% (0/36)
Region 10	97% (30/31)	3% (1/31)

Eight (8) of the regional programs had findings of noncompliance of which 3 had noncompliance that was child-specific. Five regional programs (regions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7) were required to develop written corrective action plans as a result of extensive noncompliance. All noncompliance was required to be corrected. The state required all regional programs to report root causes for all noncompliance. The following table summarizes the root causes that were identified in each region. (NOTE: Each regions’ performance on timely services is also included)

Table 6: Root Cause of Noncompliance by Region

Root Cause of Noncompliance by Region	Region									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	80%	79%	100%	85%	87%	96%	81%	96%	100%	97%
Service Coordinator did not make referral to the community-based provider in sufficient time for provider to initiate services within timeline		x		x	x		x			x
Community-based providers’ availability is not tracked on an ongoing basis impacting the service coordinators’ ability to find an available provider within timelines	x	x		x	x		x			
Community provider did not schedule initiation of services within timelines due to administrative issues							x			
Personnel shortage	x							x		
New community provider did not understand the requirements related to timely services	x				x	x	x			
Records (IFSP, medical report, contact information for family) were not transferred to service providers in a timely manner impacting timely implementation of services	x	x		x	x		x			x

